arXiv:math-ph/0503041v1 15 Mar 2005

OPERATOR SEPARATION OF VARIABLES FOR ADIABATIC PROBLEMS IN QUANTUM AND WAVE MECHANICS

Belov V.V.* Dobrokhotov S.Yu.† Tudorovskiy T.Ya.‡

Abstract

We study linear problems of mathematical physics in which the adiabatic approximation is used in the wide sense. Using the idea that all these problems can be treated as problems with operator-valued symbol, we propose a general regular scheme of adiabatic approximation based on operator methods. This scheme is a generalization of the Born–Oppenheimer and Maslov methods, the Peierls substitution, etc. The approach proposed in this paper allows one to obtain "effective" reduced equations for a wide class of states inside terms (i.e., inside modes, subregions of dimensional quantization, etc.) with the possible degeneration taken into account. Next, applying the asymptotic methods in particular, the semiclassical approximation method, to the reduced equation, one can classify the states corresponding to a distinguished term (effective Hamiltonian). We show that the adiabatic effective Hamiltonian and the semiclassical Hamiltonian can be different, which results in the appearance of "nonstandard characteristics" while one passes to classical mechanics. This approach is used to construct solutions of several problems in wave and quantum mechanics, in particular, problems in molecular physics, solid-state physics, nanophysics, hydrodynamics.

Keywords: adiabatic and semiclassical approximation, Born–Oppenheimer method, Maslov operator methods.

1 Introduction

Many linear problems of mathematical and theoretical physics contain different spatio-temporal scales. Among them there are problems of molecular physics, problems concerning electron waves in crystals, wave propagation in media with rapidly varying characteristics, surface and internal waves in fluids, electron–phonon interaction, electromagnetic waves and quantum particles propagation in waveguides, etc. The main instruments for investigating such problems are contained in the adiabatic approximation, which is based on the idea of separation of "fast" and "slow" modes by means of "freezing" the slowly varying variables.

---

*Institute for Electronics and Mathematics, Trekhsvyatitelskiy per., 3/12, 109028, Moscow, Russia, E-mail: belov@miem.edu.ru

†Institute for Problems in Mechanics Russian Academy of Sciences, prosp.Vernadskogo, 101-1, Moscow 119526 Russia; E-mail: dobr@ipmnet.ru

‡Institute for Problems in Mechanics of Russian Academy of Sciences, prosp.Vernadskogo, 101-1, Moscow 119526 Russia; E-mail: timtudor@mail.ru

For instance, the “slow” variables describe the nuclear motion in molecules and the “fast” variables concern the electron motion, or the “slow” variables describe the longitudinal motion and the “fast” variables describe the transverse motion in thin waveguides. Needless to say that there are many different versions of adiabatic approximation and thousands papers and monographs related to this approach and its applications in different fields of mechanics and physics. Among them we mention [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Nevertheless, we take the liberty to present a general regular scheme of the adiabatic approximation suggested in [11, 12, 13] and to combine different approaches including the Born–Oppenheimer method, the Maslov operator method, the Peierls substitution, etc. From the mathematical viewpoint, the equations (or the system of equations) describing all these phenomena have the same structure. Namely, following [6], these equations (systems) can be treated as equations with “operator-valued symbol.” Our idea of the study of such equations is not new: the asymptotic analysis of the original problem can be divided into two parts: (1) the “operator” reduction to simpler differential or pseudodifferential equations with the principal symbol, known in different fields of physics as an effective Hamiltonian, or therm, or dispersion relation, or mode, etc., and with corrections to this symbol; (2) asymptotic constructions of the solutions of this simpler reduced equation based on different variants of the semiclassical approaches, like the WKB-method, Born-method, oscillatory approximations, ray expansions, the Maslov canonical operator, averaging, etc. Here we present the first part of this concept in the form of a regular rigorous algorithm (in §3), based on operator methods [14].

The result of the first step is the reduced equation; it has different names in different fields of physics, we call it the *effective equation of adiabatic motion*. We illustrate the “operator” reduction or the “operator separation” of variables by using the above-mentioned problems from different fields of physics and, in §4, present the corresponding equations for the wave functions of adiabatic motion. The examples given in items 4.1-4.4 of the paragraph were studied long ago, whereas the results of items 4.5-4.6 (as well as §5) were obtained by authors recently.

To realize the second step, it is necessary to take into account that usually the original problem includes several parameters: some of them, like the transverse and longitudinal characteristic sizes of a waveguide or the ratio between the masses of light and heavy particles, allow one to use the adiabatic approximation and do not crucially correlate with the energy of adiabatic motion, and the other ones, like magnitudes of the external electromagnetic field, the momentum of the incoming wave in the scattering problem, etc., determine the energy. This fact implies different forms of (asymptotic) wave functions of adiabatic motion and, as a consequence, a redefinition of the principal symbol and the effective Hamiltonians depending on the relations between the above-mentioned parameters. In turn, it gives different types of characteristics (trajectories of Hamiltonian systems) which V. Maslov [15] called “nonstandard characteristics” and which must be used in asymptotic constructions. We discuss the possible classification of these characteristics using, as the main example, the quantum wave propagation in thin (or *nano*) tubes. In spite of the fact that the given arguments seem to be natural, and in some way contain in physical literature, we didn’t find their systematic consideration. The methods for constructing asymptotic or exact solutions of the “redefined” equation for the wave functions of adiabatic motion are well known and here the results must be connected with a concrete physical problem. Therefore, we do not construct asymptotic solutions for most of the derived reduced equations and in §5 only briefly describe different solutions for the equations of quantum particles in nanostructures.

The main results of the “operator separation of variables” are realized in formulas (3.5), (3.7) and Eq. (3.11). Although they simply develop the approach of Born-Oppenhiemer, Peierls and Maslov, nevertheless, they allow us to consider a wide range of adiabatic problems uniformly and in a rather compact form. We believe that this approach is very useful in different situations, since it gives not only a general regular scheme for deriving the reduced equations exactly but allows one to obtain qualitative and quantitative estimates of the range of applicability of any approximation. Naturally, the argument resulting in formulas (3.5) and (3.7), the classification of different approximations, the relations between the adiabatic and semiclassical asymptotics, etc. can be better illustrated with a simple example. These considerations, some of which are well known in physics and some of which are well known in mathematics, are given in §2 and §§3.1-3.2. In §2, we present a minimal amount of the required information from the operator calculus of noncommuting operators [14] (see also [19]). We point out that the facts from [14] used here are not simply arguments of "mathematical justification and verification" type, but are completely constructive and developed algorithms well adjusted to the problems studied here.

Finally we can formulate the main result of the paper in the following way. We suggest the regular asymptotic (adiabatic) procedure which allows one 1) to determine correctly the leading part of asymptotic solution corresponding to wide diapason of energies (or frequencies) 2) to construct and estimate if necessary the "adiabatic" corrections. Needless to say that in this work we understand an asymptotic solution in the formal sense, i.e. in the sense of small "right hand side" (discrepancy). The proof of the fact that the constructed asymptotic solution approximate some exact solution of original equation is out of scope of our consideration here and we touch this problem only very briefly.

2 Differential and pseudodifferential operators with a parameter and their symbols. Elementary formulas from calculus of noncommuting operators.

We want to study some asymptotic solutions of (systems of) partial differential equations with small parameter μ in the configuration space with coordinates $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ which can be written in general form:

$$i\Psi_t = \hat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi. \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\Psi(x,t)$ can be a scalar or vector function, $\mathcal{H}$ is a partial differential scalar or matrix operator. It is convenient for us to present the operator $\mathcal{H}$ as a function of noncommuting operators $-i\partial/\partial x = (-i\partial/\partial x_1, \dots, -i\partial/\partial x_N)$ and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ and, generally speaking, of time t: $\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}(\overset{2}{-i\partial/\partial x_1}, \dots, -i\partial/\partial x_N, \overset{1}{x_1}, \dots, x_N, t)$, where the function $\mathcal{H}(p_1, \dots, p_n, x_1, \dots, x_N, t)$ is usually called the symbol of the operator $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$. Actually, we shall consider the situation in which the function $\mathcal{H}$ can depend on the parameter μ and also on some other ones. Quite often a small parameter μ appears as a factor before the derivatives $\partial/\partial x_j$, say, before $\partial/\partial x_1, \dots, \partial/\partial x_n$, $n \leq N$. It follows from the considerations given below that there is always a parameter μ before $\partial/\partial t$. We denote the other variables by $y_1, \dots, y_m$, $m = N - n$. So finally Eq. (2.1) takes the form

$$i\mu\Psi_t = \mathcal{H}\left(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}, \dots, -i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}, x_1, \dots, x_n, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1}, \dots, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y_m}, y_1, \dots, y_m, t, \mu\right)\Psi \tag{2.2}$$

As the operators $\partial/\partial x_j$ and x_j, as well as operators $\partial/\partial y_k$ and y_k do not commute, one has to agree about the order of action of x_j and $\partial/\partial x_j$ and, analogously, of y_k and $\partial/\partial y_k$.

The theory of functions of noncommuting operators is very well developed [14], see also [19, 21, 22]. For the completeness of consideration, let us present a minimal amount of the required information from the operator calculus and recall the terminology.

First, let $R(x,p)=\sum_{k=0}^{l}R_k(x)p^k$ be a polynomial in variables p with coefficients smooth in x. This function generates the operator $\hat{R}=\sum_{k=0}^{l}R_k(x)(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k$. The function $R(x,p)$ is called the symbol of the differential operator $\hat{R}$ with a parameter μ. It is clear that the way of the construction of the operator $\hat{R}$ by means of the symbol R is not unique. For example, one can build an operator $\hat{R}'=\sum_{k=0}^{l}(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^k R_k(x)$, different from $\hat{R}$. Using the Feynman notation, we can write $\hat{R}=R(\overset{1}{\hat{p}},\overset{2}{x})$ and $\hat{R}=R'(\overset{2}{\hat{p}},\overset{1}{x})$, where the numbers above $\hat{p}$ and x determine the order of their action. (About other ways of ordering, for example, by Weyl, see [14]). In this work, we will always use the first way of ordering. Under this agreement, the definition of the differential operator is equivalent to the definition of its symbol. By letting the order of the polynomial k tend to infinity, one can obtain, at least, "naive" operators whose symbols are not polynomials. Such operators are called pseudodifferential. Their rigorous definition is given by means of the "μ-Fourier transform" [6, 14]:

$$A(\overset{1}{\hat{p}},\overset{2}{x})\varphi(x)=F^{\mu}_{p\to x}[A(p,x)[F^{\mu}_{x\to p}\varphi(x)](p)](x); \tag{2.3}$$

where the direct and inverse "μ-Fourier transforms" $F^{\mu}_{x\to p}$ and $F^{\mu}_{p\to x}$ are defined by the equalities:

$$[F^{\mu}_{x\to p}\varphi(x)](p)=\frac{1}{(2\pi i\mu)^{n/2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_x}e^{-i\langle p,x\rangle/\mu}\varphi(x)dx,\ [F^{\mu}_{p\to x}\tilde{\varphi}(p)](x)=\frac{1}{(-2\pi i\mu)^{n/2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n_p}e^{i\langle p,x\rangle/\mu}\tilde{\varphi}(p)dp.$$

From now on, $\langle,\rangle$ is the inner product in the Euclidean space of the corresponding dimension.

The replacement of operators by their symbols turns out to be very useful in practical calculations. As a result, the calculations concerning operators are replaced by significantly simpler work (which can be algorithmized) with symbols, i.e., functions ("with c-numbers"). Since, in asymptotic approaches, defining an operator is practically equivalent to defining its symbol, in the process of obtaining asymptotic formulas *one can manipulate only with symbols and "recall" the operators corresponding to these symbols only in studying refined problems such as, for example, justification of the asymptotic accuracy of the solutions constructed.* Of course, the main difficulties in dealing with functions of operators arise due to the fact that the operators $\hat{p}$ and x do not commute. On the other hand, their commutator is $i\mu$, and it is small, which allows one to use asymptotic expansions in the constructions. In view of this fact, it is natural to consider the symbols R depending on the parameter μ and to assume that $R(p,x,\mu)=R_0(p,x)+\mu R_1(p,x)+\cdots$. Moreover, the right-hand side in this relation is understood as an asymptotic expansion in the parameter μ. The function $R_0(p,x)$ is called the leading symbol or, sometimes, a Hamiltonian, and R_j are called jth-order corrections.

The next generalization consists in the assumption that the symbol of the operator $\hat{R}$ may be *an operator.* A simple example appears in the situation in which $R(p,x,\mu)$ is a matrix (or an operator acting in a finite-dimensional space).

Example 1. The Klein–Gordon equation. Consider, for instance, the Klein–Gordon equation $\mu^2\varphi_{tt}-\mu^2\varphi_{xx}+v(x)\varphi=0$ written in vector form for the vector function $\Psi=\begin{pmatrix}\Psi_1\\ \Psi_2\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix}\varphi\\ i\mu\varphi_t\end{pmatrix}$:

$$i\mu\Psi_t=\mathcal{H}(-i\mu\partial/\partial x,x)\Psi,\qquad\Leftrightarrow\qquad\left\{\begin{array}{l}i\mu\Psi_{1t}=\Psi_2,\\ i\mu\Psi_{2t}=v(x)\Psi_1+\mu^2\Psi_{2xx}.\end{array}\right. \tag{2.4}$$

The symbol of the operator $\mathcal{H}(p,x)$ is the 2×2 matrix function

$$\mathcal{H}(p,x)=\begin{pmatrix}0 & 1\\ p^2+v(x) & 0\end{pmatrix}.$$

From this viewpoint, one can consider many fundamental physical equations like the Dirac and Pauli equations, the Lamé equation in linear elasticity theory, the linearized hydrodynamics equations, etc. (If they include a small parameter in an appropriate way.) The appearance of a small parameter μ before the derivative $\partial/\partial x$ is very important in our constructions. As we have mentioned, there exist many problems with different scales in which a small parameter appears only in front of some derivatives. Problems of such types give the majority of nontrivial μ-differential operators with operator-valued symbols.

Example 2. Molecular physics. Consider, for instance, the Schrödinger equation for two groups of particles: heavy atomic nuclei with mass M and light electrons with mass m. We denote the coordinates of nuclei and electrons by x' and y', respectively. Let us assume that l_0 is the linear size of a molecule and d_0 is the amplitude of nuclear oscillations. Thus the characteristic magnitude of the electron energy is $\varepsilon_e\sim\hbar^2/(2ml_0^2)$. By physical reasons (stated by Born and Oppenheimer), the motion of a nucleus could be considered in the oscillatory approximation and its energy is $\varepsilon_n\sim\hbar^2/(2Md_0^2)\sim kd_0^2/2$ with the elasticity coefficient k. To estimate k, one has to remember that, in the adiabatic approximation, the potential energy of a nucleus is the total energy of electrons [16], so $k\sim\partial^2\varepsilon_e/\partial x^2\sim\hbar^2/(ml_0^4)$. Thus we have $\hbar^2/(2Md_0^2)\sim\hbar^2d_0^2/(2ml_0^4)$. From this, we obtain $d_0/l_0\sim(m/M)^{1/4}$. Oscillatory energies of nuclei and electrons relate as $\varepsilon_n/\varepsilon_e\sim(m/M)(l_0^2/d_0^2)\sim(m/M)^{1/2}$. Let us introduce the parameter $\mu=(m/M)^{1/2}$ and divide both sides of the Schrödinger equation by $\hbar^2/(2ml_0^2)$. After passage to dimensionless variables $x=x'/l_0,\ y=y'/l_0$, the stationary Schrödinger equation takes the form

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi=E\Psi,\qquad \hat{\mathcal{H}}=\left(-\frac{1}{2}\mu^2\Delta_x-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_y+v(x,y)\right)\Psi=E\Psi. \tag{2.5}$$

The symbol $\mathcal{H}$ of the μ-differential[1] operator $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is again the operator

$$\mathcal{H}(p,x)=\frac{1}{2}p^2-\frac{1}{2}\Delta_y+v(x,y). \tag{2.6}$$

Usually, x *are called slow variables and* y *are called fast ones.* Ideologically close approaches to the determination of electron states (*terms*) in molecule one can find in [6, 8, 9, 17].

Example 3. Quantum 2-D waveguide. One can meet an equation with closed structure considering a "narrow" straight quantum waveguide. The word "narrow" means that the characteristic width of the waveguide d_0 is much smaller than its length l_0. We introduce the small parameter $\mu=d_0/l_0$. The dynamics of a spinless quantum (quasi)particle in a plane waveguide is determined by the 2-D Shrödinger equation with the potential $v=v(x,y)$ inside the waveguide. Due to two different scales, there appear two different characteristic energies: the characteristic energy of the lower transverse levels (which is usually called the characteristic energy of the "transverse quantization") and the characteristic longitudinal energy $\varepsilon_\parallel$. One can estimate $\varepsilon_\perp$ from the uncertainty principle, which gives $\varepsilon_\perp=\hbar^2/(2md_0^2)$. Let us introduce dimensionless variables $x'=x/l_0$, $y'=y/d_0$, $t=(\mu\omega_\perp)^{-1}$, $\omega_\perp=\varepsilon_\perp/\hbar$ and dimensionless potentials $v' = v/\varepsilon_\perp$. Then the corresponding Schrödinger equation takes the form (we omit the primes of the dimensionless variables):

---

[1] Born and Oppenheimer in their famous paper [1] used the parameter $\varkappa=\sqrt{\mu}$, which is the ratio $d_0/l_0\sim\varkappa$ of the characteristic wavelength to the wave function and the linear size of the molecule.

$$i\mu \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial t} = \hat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi, \qquad \hat{\mathcal{H}} = \left(-\frac{\mu^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} - \frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + v(x,y) \right) \Psi. \tag{2.7}$$

The symbol of the μ-differential operator is the operator (2.6) with $\Delta_y = \partial^2/\partial y^2$.

Generalizations of the plane quantum waveguide are quantum thin tubes (nanotubes) and thin films (nanofilms), and their symbols are matrix-operators if one includes spin into consideration. These more complicated examples, as well as several examples from other fields, will be considered later.

Let us again stress that the *definition of the symbol of a μ-differential operator differs from the standard definition of the symbol of an operator without parameter.* Namely, we construct the symbol taking only the slow variables into account. This is why the symbols of the μ-differential operator $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ in Examples 2 and 3 are again differential operators acting in some appropriate Hilbert space with coordinates y. The transition to μ-differential symbols is a formalization of the idea of "freezing the slow variables." We discuss the related problems later. The introduction of a small parameter μ formally ensures that the commutator $[x, \hat{\mathcal{H}}]$ is small. There is no universal interpretation of this fact; this depends on each concrete physical problem.

Let us also note that one can consider the equations from Examples 2 and 3 as infinite vector ones. To show this, let us assume, for simplicity, that, for each $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the spectrum of the operator $-(1/2)\partial^2/\partial y^2 + v(x,y)$ is discrete and simple and that the corresponding eigenfunctions $\{w_n(x,y)\}$ and eigenvalues $\lambda_n(x)$ depend smoothly on x. Then one can expand any solution $\Psi(x,y,t)$ of Eq. (2.7) in the Fourier series

$$\Psi = \sum_k w_k(x,y)\psi_k(x,t). \tag{2.8}$$

Substituting solution (2.8) into Eq. (2.7), we obtain:

$$i\mu \frac{\partial \psi_k}{\partial t} = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\frac{\partial^2 \psi_k}{\partial x^2} - \mu^2 \sum_n \langle w_k, \frac{\partial w_n}{\partial x}\rangle_y \frac{\partial \psi_n}{\partial x} - \frac{\mu^2}{2}\sum_n \langle w_k, \frac{\partial^2 w_n}{\partial x^2}\rangle_y \psi_n \tag{2.9}$$

If we introduce the infinite vector $\psi = (\psi_1, \psi_2, \ldots)^T$, then we can represent Eq. (2.9) as the following infinite vector equation with infinite-dimensional matrix Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$:

$$i\mu\psi_t = \hat{\mathcal{H}}\psi, \quad \hat{\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}_0(p,x) + \mu\mathcal{H}_1(p,x) + \mu^2\mathcal{H}_2(p,x),$$
$$(\mathcal{H}_0)_{kn} = \left(\frac{p^2}{2} + \lambda_n(x)\right)\delta_{kn}, \quad (\mathcal{H}_1)_{kn} = -i\langle w_k, \frac{\partial w_n}{\partial x}\rangle_y p, \quad (\mathcal{H}_2)_{kn} = -\frac{1}{2}\langle w_k, \frac{\partial^2 w_n}{\partial x^2}\rangle_y.$$

In all examples considered above, the momentum operators corresponding to the slow variables x_j are $-i\mu\partial/\partial x_j$. Of course, one can consider a general situation in which the Hamiltonian depends on the operators $\hat{x}_j$, $\hat{p}_j$ generating the Heisenberg algebra with commutators $[\hat{p}_j, \hat{x}_k] = \mu\delta_{j,k}$, $\mu \ll 1$. Such a situation appears in the electron-phonon interaction, we shall discuss it in §4. The other obvious generalizations of the equations with operator-valued symbols are vector equations containing "slow" and "fast" variables. For instance, we can consider the Pauli equation in a thin quantum waveguide. In this case (see §4.6), the symbol is a matrix operator differential with respect to fast variables.

To conclude this section, we present a useful formula which plays an important role in the future consideration. Let $\hat{A}$ and $\hat{B}$ be pseudodifferential operators

$$\hat{A} = A(\overset{1}{-i\mu\partial/\partial x}, \overset{2}{x}, \mu), \qquad \hat{B} = B(\overset{1}{-i\mu\partial/\partial x}, \overset{2}{x}, \mu),$$

then the symbol $smb(\hat{A}\hat{B})$ of their product $\hat{A}\hat{B}$ is equal to (see [14])

$$smb(\hat{A}\hat{B}) = A(p \overset{1}{-i\mu\partial/\partial x}, \overset{2}{x}, \mu)B(p, x, \mu). \tag{2.10}$$

3 General scheme of the operator separation of variables in adiabatic problems.

3.1 General statement of the problem with operator-valued symbols and parameters.

We are going to construct a certain asymptotic solution $\Psi = (\Psi^1, \dots, \Psi^s)^T$, $s \geq 2$, to vector equation (2.2) with a small parameter $\mu \ll 1$ or its stationary variant

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi = E\Psi. \tag{3.1}$$

In (2.2) and in (3.1), the matrix operator (quantum matrix Hamiltonian) $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ is generated by its operator-valued symbol

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(p, x, -i\partial/\partial y, y, t, \mu) = \left\| \begin{matrix} \mathcal{H}_{11} & \dots & \mathcal{H}_{1s} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \mathcal{H}_{s1} & \dots & \mathcal{H}_{ss} \end{matrix} \right\|,$$

$$\mathcal{H}_{ij} = \mathcal{H}_{ij}(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, t, \mu), \qquad 1 \leq i, j \leq s.$$

(In the stationary case, $\mathcal{H}_{ij}$ do not depend on time t.) We assume that the operator-valued symbol (the matrix-operator) $\mathcal{H} = \|\mathcal{H}_{ij}(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, \mu)\|$ smoothly depends on p, x, t and acts in an appropriate vector Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_y$ with coordinates y from some domain $\mathbb{M}_y$ and with the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle|_y$ (for instance, in $L_2(\mathbb{M}_y) \times L_2(\mathbb{M}_y) \times \ldots \times L_2(\mathbb{M}_y)$). Another natural assumption is that the symbol $\mathcal{H}(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, \mu)$ can be expanded into a regular series with respect to the parameter μ:

$$\mathcal{H}(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, t, \mu) = \mathcal{H}_0(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, t) + \mu\mathcal{H}_1(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, t) + \dots. \tag{3.2}$$

We also assume that the (pseudo)differential operator $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ acts in an appropriate expanded Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_{x,y}$ with coordinates $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^n_x \times \mathbb{M}_y$ and all the future operations related to them are valid. Of course, one has to verify the last assumption in each concrete problem. Usually (but not always), we shall consider situations in which $\mathcal{H}$, as well as the operator $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$, are essentially self-adjoint.

It is important to emphasize again that in (2.2) there is a small "adiabatic" parameter μ in front of the derivatives with respect to "slow" variables x, but there is no small parameter in front of the derivatives with respect to "fast" variables y.

Of course, one has to add additional boundary and initial conditions to Eq. (2.2). We shall do it later after the discussion in §4, and now we only note that we are going to consider only special problems interesting from the physical viewpoint. The statements of these problems follow the adiabatic separation of the original Eq. (2.2) into a set of reduced equations corresponding to different "terms" or "modes" and determined by "effective Hamiltonians" or "dispersion relations." We present our concept of this separation (the "operator separation of variables") together with the corresponding formulas in the two subsequent sections.

3.2 Anzatz of the operator separation of variables.

Let us illustrate the main ideas of the operator separation of variables in adiabatic problems with an example of a "quantum waveguide" (2.7). If the potential $v(x, y)$ is the sum $v_1(x) + v_2(y)$, one can separate the variables and find a special solution to Eq. (2.7) as a product of two functions (modes) $\chi(y, \mu)\psi(x, t, \mu)$. It is clear that this representation is not true if $v(x, y) \neq v_1(x) + v_2(y)$, nevertheless, since there are different scales in the longitudinal and transverse directions, we can separate the modes adiabatically. According to the standard adiabatic approach based on the fundamental papers by Born and Oppenheimer, the leading term of the wave function in the adiabatic approximation is sought in the form of the product

$$\Psi(x, y, t, \mu) \approx \chi(x, y, \mu)\psi(x, t, \mu). \tag{3.3}$$

But this representation can be used in a situation when the function $\psi(x, t, \mu)$ is quite smooth and works poorly for large enough energies of longitudinal motion. If the function $\psi(x, t, \mu)$ exhibits fast oscillations, for instance, if ψ is the WKB-solution $\psi(x, t, \mu) = \exp(iS(x, t, \mu)/\mu)\varphi(x, t, \mu, h)$, then representation (3.3) is not convenient for the asymptotic expansion and, instead of formula (3.3), one has to include the classical momentum $\partial S/\partial x$ into the factor $\chi(y, x, \mu)$ and use the formula [6]

$$\Psi(x, y, t, \mu) \approx \chi(\partial S/\partial x, x, y, \mu)\psi(x, t, \mu). \tag{3.4}$$

Recall that the phase S is the solution of the Hamilton–Jacobi equation $\partial S/\partial t + H_{\text{eff}}(\partial S/\partial x, x, t) = 0$ with the so-called effective Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}(p, x, t)$. For the case in which $H_{\text{eff}}(p, x, t)$ is a function of p only and $S = -\omega t + px$, the Hamilton–Jacoby equation is the *dispersion relation.* Formula (3.4) is still not satisfactory, because for the case in which there exist focalization effects, i.e., there are turning points or caustics, the WKB-representation is not true, and it is necessary to change the form of ψ and the form of χ. We propose to "correct" (3.4) in such a way that a new formula would also work in the case of focal and turning points. This correction is based on the observation that, in the WKB-case modulo a small correction, the right-hand side in (3.4) remains the same (see, e.g., [6]) if one assumes that the first factor is the (pseudodifferential) *operator* $\chi(-i\mu\overset{1}{\partial}/\partial x, \overset{2}{x}, y, t, \mu)$ written as a function (its symbol) of the noncommuting operators x and $\hat{p} = -i\mu\partial/\partial x$. Finally, we suggest to look for the solution $\Psi(x, y, t)$ in the adiabatic approach in the following form [11, 13, 19, 20]:

$$\Psi(x, y, t, \mu) = \chi(-i\mu\overset{1}{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, \overset{2}{x}, y, t, \mu)\psi(x, t, \mu), \tag{3.5}$$

where $\hat{\chi}$ is the "pseudodifferentional" operator whose symbol has the (asymptotic) expansion with respect to the parameter μ

$$\chi(p, x, y, t, \mu) = \chi_0(p, x, y, t) + \mu\chi_1(p, x, y, t) + \dots. \tag{3.6}$$

From the physical viewpoint, representation (3.5) means that we "freeze" not only slow variables x as in formula (3.3), but also slow momenta, which are differential operators $-i\mu\partial/\partial x$ in quantum mechanics. Note that in many situations the leading term $\chi_0(p,x,y,t)$ in expansion (3.6) does not depend on p, but the corrections usually do. This dependence plays an important role in the estimation of the limits of the adiabatic approximation in concrete problems.

We still do not fix the equation for the function ψ describing the longitudinal motion. Following the idea of the so-called *Peierls substitution* in solid state physics (see, e.g., [2, 5, 18]), we assume that the wave function ψ is a solution of the following equation (describing the longitudinal dynamics):

$$i\mu\psi_t = \hat{L}\psi, \qquad \hat{L} = L(\overset{1}{-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, \overset{2}{x}, t, \mu), \tag{3.7}$$

where $\hat{L}$ is a pseudodifferential (sometimes, differential) operator with symbol $L(p,x,t,\mu)$ having the expansion

$$L(p,x,t,\mu) = L_0(p,x,t) + \mu L_1(p,x,t) + \dots. \tag{3.8}$$

The operator $\hat{L}$ is called the (full) quantum effective Hamiltonian with the principal part $\hat{L}_0$. Sometimes, the symbol L_0 is also called an effective classical Hamiltonian and is denoted by $L_0 = H_{\text{eff}}(p,x,t)$. The operator $\hat{\chi}$ will be called an *intertwining* operator (cf. [14, 21, 22]). Equation (3.7) can also be understood as the *quantization of the Hamilton–Jacobi equation or the dispersion relation.* The wave function ψ has different names in different fields. For instance, ψ is a nuclear function in molecular physics, a longitudinal wave function in waveguides, an electron function in crystals, etc. We shall call it a *wave function of adiabatic motion* and we shall call Eq. (3.7) the effective equation of adiabatic motion.

Representation (3.5) together with Eq. (3.7) (a generalization of the Peierls substitution) is a formalization of the operator separation of variables in the adiabatic approximation. Of course, the corrections L_1, L_2, ... appear in the problems in which the variables cannot be separated exactly.

The reduced equation (3.7) contains less independent variables and hence should be simpler than the original one. Thus, we see (and we mentioned this in Introduction) that solving the original equation can be divided into two parts: **1)** *the "operator* (*adiabatic*) *separation of variables" based on formula* (3.5), *which reduces the original equation to Eq.* (3.7), *and* **2)** *the process of solving this simpler equation.*

The realization of the first step consists in finding the symbols (functions) χ_j and L_j. We shall state the general scheme of their construction and discuss different related questions (e.g., concerning the reasonable number of terms in expansions (3.6), (3.8)) in the next sections. Now we discuss a natural generalization of the operators $\hat{\chi}$ and $\hat{L}$.

It is easy to see that, in the case of exact separation of variables, $\chi = \chi_0$ is an eigenfunction of some additional spectral problem. The same fact holds for the functions $\chi_0(x,p,y,t)$; later we shall numerate them by a multiindex ν. Thus formula (3.5) describes only some special solutions of the original equation corresponding to the term with the index ν. It is possible to construct more general ones summing solutions (3.5) with different indices ν and the corresponding $\hat{\chi}$, ψ. Another conclusion is that, in the case of exact separation of variables, the spectrum of the above-mentioned additional spectral problem can be degenerate and several eigenfunctions can correspond to the same eigenvalue. Then, instead of the product $\chi(y,\mu)\psi(x,t,\mu)$, one should write the sum $\sum_{j=1}^{k}\chi_j(y,\mu)\psi_j(x,t,\mu)$, where k is the multiplicity of the corresponding eigenvalue. The same generalization should be performed in formula (3.5). Also if the original problem is a vector one (i.e., if (2.2) is a system of PDE for s unknown functions), then $\hat{\chi}_j$ has s components. Finally, in formula (3.5) and in Eq. (3.7) we mean the following:

1) $\hat{\chi}$ is a matrix pseudodifferential operator with s rows and r columns,

2) ψ is an k-dimensional vector function $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k)^T$,

3) L is an $k \times k$ matrix pseudodifferential operator with the principal symbol $L_0 = H_{\text{eff}}(p, x)E_k$, where the number r determines the multiplicity of the corresponding effective Hamiltonian H_{eff} and E_k is the $k \times k$ identity matrix. The corrections L_j usually are not diagonal, which means that interaction is present inside the mode (or the term) determined by this effective Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}(p, x)$.

The number of terms in the expansions of the intertwining operator $\hat{\chi}$ and the operator $\hat{L}$ (with fixed index ν) can be arbitrarily large. However, it is, as a rule, a very complicated problem to calculate the terms of these series explicitly, even terms with small numbers. Therefore, it is natural to consider only the terms required to estimate correctly the *leading* term of the asymptotics of the wave function or of the energy value.

However, the notion of the "leading" term of an asymptotics can be determined not only by the adiabatic parameter μ, but also by the other ones, for instance, by the so-called "semiclassical parameter" h, which is related to the form of the effective potential and the solution of the reduced equation (3.7). The appearance of this new parameter is very important for future constructions of the asymptotics. We shall discuss the corresponding questions in detail later in §5. Now we only say that, usually, for the construction of the leading term of asymptotic solution, it is sufficient to find L_0, L_1, and $L_2|_{p=0}$. Another interesting fact is that the effects of a semiclassical splitting of the effective Hamiltonian and a change in the classical characteristics occur in the degenerate case (see §4.6).

3.3 Scheme of the operator separation of variables

To simplify the future consideration, let us assume that, in Eqs.(2.2) and (3.1), $\mathcal{H}$ and the operator $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ are essentially self-adjoint. We shall seek the solution of Eq. (2.2) in the following form:

$$\Psi_i(x, y, t, \mu) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \chi_{ij}(\overset{2}{x}, -i\mu \overset{1}{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, y, t, \mu)\psi_j(x, t, \mu) = (\hat{\chi}\psi)_i, \tag{3.9}$$

where $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_k)^T$ is the wave function of some chosen *term* (or a chosen "fast" mode) with the degeneration multiplicity equal to k and $\hat{\chi}$ is an *intertwining* matrix pseudodifferential operator:

$$\hat{\chi} = \begin{Vmatrix} \hat{\chi}_{11} & \cdots & \hat{\chi}_{1k} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \hat{\chi}_{s1} & \cdots & \hat{\chi}_{sk} \end{Vmatrix}, \qquad \chi(p, x, y, t, \mu) = \chi_0(p, x, y, t) + \mu\chi_1(p, x, y, t) + \dots. \tag{3.10}$$

We assume that the vector function ψ satisfies the "effective equation of adiabatic motion" (3.7) generated by the matrix operator $\hat{L}$

$$\hat{L} = \begin{Vmatrix} \hat{L}_{11} & \dots & \hat{L}_{1k} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \hat{L}_{k1} & \dots & \hat{L}_{kk} \end{Vmatrix}, \qquad L(p, x, t, \mu) = L_0(p, x, t) + \mu L_1(p, x, t) + \dots,$$

where the matrix $L_0(p, x, t)$ is proportional to the unitary $k \times k$ matrix E_k: $L_0(p, x, t) = H_{\text{eff}}E_k$. The coefficient of proportionality H_{eff} is an *effective Hamiltonian.* Hence the problem is reduced to finding the operators $\hat{\chi}$ and $\hat{L}$ or their *symbols* χ and L. After we find them, we can reduce the initial problem to a more simple (reduced) equation (3.7) for the vector function ψ. The original solution Ψ can be reconstructed in accordance with (3.9).

Substituting the function Ψ from (3.9) into Eq. (2.2), we obtain:

$$i\mu\hat{\chi}\psi_t + i\mu\hat{\chi}_t\psi = \hat{\mathcal{H}}\hat{\chi}\psi.$$

Using condition (3.7), rewrite this equation in the following form: $(\hat{\chi}\hat{L}+i\mu\hat{\chi}_t-\hat{\mathcal{H}}\hat{\chi})\psi = 0$. A sufficient condition for the last equality to be valid is the operator relation $\hat{\chi}\hat{L}+i\mu\hat{\chi}_t-\hat{\mathcal{H}}\hat{\chi} = 0$. Let us pass from operators to symbols [6] in this relation using formula (2.10). This leads to the equation

$$\chi(p - i\mu\overset{1}{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, \overset{2}{x}, y, t, \mu)L(x, p, t, \mu) + i\mu\chi_t(p, x, y, t, \mu) -$$

$$-\mathcal{H}(p - i\mu\overset{1}{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, \overset{2}{x}, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, t, \mu)\chi(p, x, y, t, \mu) = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

It can be solved using regular perturbation theory, i.e., expanding the items into series with respect to μ. Collecting terms of order $\mu^0 = 1$, we obtain a family of spectral problems for the self-adjoint operator $\mathcal{H}_0(p, x, y, -i\partial/\partial y, t)$ depending on x, p, t:

$$\mathcal{H}_0(p, x, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, y, t)\chi_0(p, x, y, t) = \chi_0(p, x, y, t)L_0(p, x, t). \tag{3.12}$$

We shall assume that the asymptotics (3.9) is completely determined by the eigenvalue (term) $H_{\text{eff}}(p, x, t)$ whose multiplicity k does not depend on p, x, t. Moreover, we shall assume that the value H_{eff} is separated from the other eigenvalues or a part of the spectrum of $\mathcal{H}_0$ (if the spectrum contains a continuous component) uniformly with respect to (p, x, t) in a certain fixed domain $(p, x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$.

So

$$L_0(p, x, t) = H_{\text{eff}}(p, x, t)E, \tag{3.13}$$

where E is a unitary $k \times k$ matrix. The matrix $\chi_0(x, p, y, t)$ consisting of orthonormal vector columns, i.e., eigenfunctions of the operator $\mathcal{H}_0$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $H_{\text{eff}}(x, p, t)$, is the *intertwining operator* on the proper subspace induced by this eigenvalue. It is natural to assume that $\chi_0(x, p, y, t)$ depends smoothly on all its arguments.

Collecting terms of order μ, we obtain inhomogeneous equations for χ_j and L_j:

$$(\mathcal{H}_0 - H_{\text{eff}}E)\chi_j = F_j - \mathcal{H}_j\chi_0 + \chi_0 L_j, \qquad j = 1, 2, \ldots \tag{3.14}$$

where F_j depend on $\chi_0, \ldots, \chi_{j-1}$ and $L_0 \ldots, L_{j-1}$, in particular,

$$F_1 = \hat{\mathcal{D}}\chi_0, \quad F_2 = \hat{\mathcal{D}}\chi_1^\nu - \mathcal{H}_1\chi_1^\nu + \chi_1^\nu L_1 + i\sum_j \left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_1}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial\chi_0^\nu}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial\chi_0^\nu}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial L_1}{\partial x^j}\right] +$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j}\left[\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_i\partial p_j}\frac{\partial^2\chi_0^\nu}{\partial x^i\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial^2 H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial x^i\partial x^j}\frac{\partial^2\chi_0^\nu}{\partial p_i\partial p_j}\right]. \tag{3.15}$$

Here

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}} = i\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + i\sum_j\left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} - \frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\right] = i\frac{d}{dt} + i\sum_j\left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_j} - \frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial p_j}\right]\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j},$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \sum_j\frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j} + \sum_j\frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}.$$

Due to the self-adjointness of the operator $(\mathcal{H}_0 - H_{\text{eff}}E)$ and the Fredholm alternative, the solvability condition for this equation is equivalent to the condition that its right-hand part is orthogonal to the vector-columns of the matrix χ_0. It follows that $L_j = \langle\chi_0^T, \mathcal{H}_j\chi_0\rangle|_y - \langle\chi_0^T, F_j\rangle|_y$. In particular, one can obtain:

$$L_1 = \left\langle\chi_0^T, \mathcal{H}_1\chi_0\right\rangle_y - i\left\langle\chi_0^T, \frac{d\chi_0}{dt}\right\rangle_y - i\left\langle\chi_0^T, \sum_{j=1}^{n}\left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_j} - \frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial p_j}\right]\frac{\partial\chi_0}{\partial x^j}\right\rangle_y. \tag{3.16}$$

Assuming that L_1 has form (3.16), one can find the correction, i.e., the matrix $\chi_1 = (\mathcal{H}_0 - H_{\text{eff}}E)^{-1}(F_1 - \mathcal{H}_1\chi_0 + \chi_0 L_1)$, fixing it for determinacy by means of the condition of orthogonality of vector-columns of the matrices χ_0 and χ_1. The reiteration of this procedure leads to calculation of L_j, χ_j. Formulas (3.13), (3.16), etc. give the coefficients of expansion of the symbol of the reduced equation (3.7). Note that the construction of the correction L_1 includes only functions of zero approximation (like in the standard perturbation theory). In general, the symbol L_2 includes χ_1, so, to find it, one has to invert the operator $(\mathcal{H}_0 - H_{\text{eff}}E)$.

Remark 1. The methods from [14] allow one to consider more general situations in which the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}(\hat{p}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}_y, \hat{y}, \mu)$ is a function of vector *operators* $(\hat{p}, \hat{x}, \hat{p}_y, \hat{y})$ with commutator relations $[\hat{x}_j, \hat{p}_j] = i\mu$, $[\hat{y}_j, \hat{p}_{yj}] = i$, $\mu \ll 1$, or even more complicated ones (see Example in Section 4.2). However in this paper we basically consider the situation in which $\hat{x} = x, \hat{p}_x = -i\mu\partial/\partial x$.

Remark 2. It is not difficult to modify the presented formal scheme for the non-self-adjoint original operator $\mathcal{H}$. In particular, one has to use the eigenfunctions of the adjoint operator in the orthogonality conditions. But, of course, it is necessary to add some additional conditions like the existence of real-valued effective Hamiltonians, etc. (see Example in section 4.3).

Remark 3. Operator separation of variables and adiabatic approximation in classical mechanics. There exist a certain classical analog of adiabatic approach based on the "operator separation of variables" ([23, 24, 25, 26, 27]). The main idea can be illustrated by means of the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(\mu p_x, x, p_y, y, \mu)$ with a small parameter μ. If we change the variables x, p_x by $\xi = x/\mu$ and $p_\xi = \mu p_x$, then we obtain a Hamiltonian of the form $\mathcal{H}(p, \mu\xi, p_y, y, \mu)$. It is convenient to write the Hamiltonian in noncanonical variables x and p, $dp \wedge dx = \mu dp_x \wedge dx = \mu dp \wedge d\xi$: $\mathcal{H}(p, x, p_y, y, \mu)$. The Hamiltonian equations for the variables p, x, p_y, y have the form

$$\dot{x} = \mu\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}}{\partial p_\xi} \ll 1, \qquad \dot{p} = -\mu\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}}{\partial x} \ll 1, \qquad \dot{y} = \frac{\partial\mathcal{H}}{\partial p_y}, \qquad \dot{p}_y = -\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}}{\partial y}. \tag{3.17}$$

Since we have $\dot{p}$, $\dot{x} \sim \mu$ for the derivatives, while $\dot{p}_y$, $\dot{y} \sim 1$, it is natural to say that the variables p, x are "slow variables" and the variables p_y, y are "fast variables." Taking into account that there are variables of two types, it is natural to "freeze" slow variables and obtain a family of Hamiltonians with k degrees of freedom depending on the parameters (p, x). We do not consider the resonanace problems and restrict our consideration to the case in which $k = 1$ and $(p_y, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Let us assume that, in some domain $(p, x) \in \Omega$, the trajectories of $\mathcal{H}(\{p, x\}, p_y, y, 0)$ are closed. The braces $\{\cdot\}$ mean that the included variables are considered as parameters (i.e., are "frozen"). Then it is possible to introduce "action-angle" variables (J, φ) corresponding to these closed trajectories. The passage to these variables is determined by the change of variables $y = Y_0(J, \varphi, p, x)$, $p_y = P_y^0(J, \varphi, p, x)$. Unfortunately, this change of variables is not canonical and, to make it canonical, one has to add corrections and write $y = Y_0(J,\varphi,P,X)+\mu Y_1(J,\varphi,P,X)+\ldots$, $p_y = P_y^0(J,\varphi,P,X)+\mu P_y^1(J,\varphi,P,X)+\ldots$, $p = P+\mu P_1(J,\varphi,P,X)+\ldots$, and $x = X+\mu X_1(J,\varphi,P,X)+\ldots$. Then the original Hamiltonian can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{H}(J,\varphi,P,X) = \mathcal{H}_0(J,P,X)+\mu\Bigg[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial y}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)Y_1+\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_y}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)P_y^1+$$

$$+\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial x}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)X_1+\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)P^1+\mathcal{H}_1(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)\Bigg]+O(\mu^2),$$

$$P_y^1 = P_y^1(J,\varphi,P,X),\quad Y_1 = Y_1(J,\varphi,P,X),\quad P^1 = P^1(J,\varphi,P,X),\quad X_1 = X_1(J,\varphi,P,X)$$
$$P_y^0 = P_y^0(J,\varphi,P,X),\qquad Y_0 = Y_0(J,\varphi,P,X),\tag{3.18}$$

where $\mathcal{H}(p,x,p_y,y,\mu) = \mathcal{H}_0(p,x,p_y,y)+\mu\mathcal{H}_1(p,x,p_y,y)+O(\mu^2)$. Now we have a typical problem from averaging theory. After averaging, we obtain two terms of the expansion of the effective Hamiltonian $L(J,P,X,\mu) = L_0(J,P,X)+\mu L_1(J,P,X)+O(\mu^2)$:

$$L_0(J,P,X) = \mathcal{H}_0(J,P,X),$$

$$L_1(J,P,X) = \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi\Bigg[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial y}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)Y_1+\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_y}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)P_y^1+$$

$$+\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial x}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)X_1+\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p}(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)P^1+\mathcal{H}_1(P,X,P_y^0,Y_0)\Bigg],\tag{3.19}$$

so $J = \mathrm{const}$ and the integration of the original system is reduced to solving a system with n degrees of freedom. The action J corresponds to the "quantum" number ν of the term χ^ν, the term $\int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi\,\mathcal{H}_1\Big(P,X,P_y^0(J,\varphi,P,X),Y_0(J,\varphi,P,X)\Big)$ corresponds to $\langle\chi_0,\mathcal{H}_1\chi_0\rangle_y$, and the corrections related to the canonical change of variables in the classical problem correspond to other terms in L_1 in quantum problem. Of course, this is simply an analogy (cf. [7, 28, 29], etc.).

Remark 4. The classical analogue of the reduction at the first stage is well known [37]: excluding the fast variables, we obtain a system in the zeroth approximation with holonomic constraints; this system is equivalent to the n-dimensional Lagrangian system. Thus the adiabatic reduction to Eq.(3.7) could be interpreted as the "excluding of quantum constraints" (see [30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36]). But the classical system corresponding to the reduced quantum system generally does not coincide with the result of the classical reduction (in the sense [37]). Moreover, the classical systems arising in the adiabatic reduction turn out to be different for different relations between μ and "semiclassical" parameter h, which will be introduced in §5; using the terminology in [15, 38], we can say that they correspond to different nonstandard characteristics of the quantum problem. For example, the classical equation of motion in nanotubes can sometimes include terms arising because spin exists. This is explainable physically because longitudinal motion is already determined by rather small energies that are quite comparable to the spin energy.

Remark 5. In some problems one can apply the semiclassical approximation to solve Eq.(3.12) (see e.g. [13, 39]).

4 Examples of problems with operator-valued symbols and parameters.

Let us illustrate the general scheme with several examples.

4.1 Equation with rapidly oscillating coefficients and electron waves in crystals

One can meet equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients in many problems of solid physics and continuum mechanics. For instance, these types of equations describe propagation of electron waves in crystals, of elastic waves in composite materials, etc. For constructing asymptotic solutions to equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients, there exist different approachs adapted to their behavior and their properties. Among these approaches, one can at least mention averaging methods, homogenization, and adiabatic approximation. There exists a very extensive literature concerning this topic and a review of all these approaches is very far from our aims. We only want to show that one can look at the equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients from the viewpoint of equations with operator-valued symbols [11, 12] and, for the construction of their asymptotics, use the method described in §4. So here we mention only the general monographs [1, 3, 40, 4, 41, 42] and ideologically close papers [43, 44, 45].

As an example, we consider the Schrödinger equation with fast oscillating potential

$$i\mu\psi_t = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\Delta\psi + v(\frac{\Phi(x)}{\mu}, x)\psi, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \Phi \in \mathbb{R}^m, \tag{4.1}$$

where $v(y,x)$ is a smooth function 2π-periodic with respect to each "fast" variable y_j, $j = 1,\dots,m$. The given phases $\Phi_j(x)$ are smooth functions. Generally speaking, their number k can be arbitrary. In some problems, the phases are linear functions $\Phi_j = \langle k_j, x_j\rangle$; the case of nonlinear phases Φ_j describes the case of a nonuniform potential v. The additional dependence of the potential on the variable x implies its slow deformation. Eq. (4.1) with such a potential simulates the propagation of electron waves in a lattice or, for instance, if $m = 1$, in stratified media. The simplest example of a rapidly oscillating potential is given by the formula ($n = 1, m = 1$): $v = v_0(x) + a(x)\cos\frac{\Phi(x)}{\mu}$, where $v_0(x), a(x)$ are smooth functions.

Let us find the unknown function $\psi(x,t,\mu)$ in the form

$$\psi(x,t,\mu) = \Psi\left(\frac{\Phi(x)}{\mu}, x, t, \mu\right), \tag{4.2}$$

where the new unknown function $\Psi(y,x,t,\mu)$ is 2π-periodic with respect to each variable y_j. Substituting (4.2) into Eq. (4.1), we see that the function $\psi(x,t,\mu)$ (4.2) satisfies Eq. (4.1) if the function $\Psi(y,x,t,\mu)$ is a solution of Eq. (2.2) with

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \left(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - i\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)^2 + v(y,x). \tag{4.3}$$

We again see that the small parameter μ is in front of the derivative $\partial/\partial x$, but there is no small parameter in front of the derivative $\partial/\partial y$. Thus the equation with Hamiltonian (4.3) is an equation with operator-valued symbol, namely,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 - \mu\sum_{j=1}^m \Delta\Phi_j\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}, \quad \mathcal{H}_0 = \left(p - i\sum_{j=1}^m \frac{\partial\Phi_j}{\partial x}\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}\right)^2 + v(y,x). \tag{4.4}$$

For each fixed (p,x), the operator $\mathcal{H}$ acts in the L_2-space on a k-dimensional torus.

If the vectors $\frac{\partial\Phi_j}{\partial x}$ are linearly independent for each x, then the spectrum of the operator $\mathcal{H}$ is discrete, but, to obtain the reduced equation, one must also use the assumption that the multiplicity of eigenvalues is independent of (p, x). In particular, if $m = 1$ and $\partial\Phi/\partial x \neq 0$, then the spectral problem (3.12) for determining the effective Hamiltonians is a periodic problem and can be reduced to the 1-D Schrödinger equation on a circle for Bloch solutions (see [20, 46]). To realize this reduction, we change the variables in the equation $\mathcal{H}_0\chi_0 = H_{\text{eff}}\chi_0$ for χ_0 and H_{eff} as follows:

$$y = U\xi, \quad \chi_0 = ue^{-iP\xi}, \qquad U = \left|\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\right|,$$

and put

$$P = P(p, x) \equiv \left\langle \frac{\partial\Phi_j}{\partial x}, p \right\rangle \Big/ \left|\frac{\partial\Phi}{\partial x}\right|^2. \tag{4.5}$$

Then this equation takes the form

$$-u_{\xi\xi} + v(U\xi, x)u = \mathcal{E}u, \quad \mathcal{E} = H_{\text{eff}} - p^2 + P^2,$$

and the periodicity condition becomes the Bloch condition:

$$u(\xi + 2\pi/U, x) = e^{2\pi iP}u(\xi, x).$$

The variable x is contained in the reduced problem as a parameter. The variable (number) P is called the *quasimomentum* of the corresponding Bloch solution. It is a well-known fact that the spectrum of the operator $-\partial^2/\partial\xi^2 + v(U\xi, x)$ on a circle consists of bands and gaps. Let us enumerate the bands by the number ν and denote the ends of the νth band by E^ν_- and E^ν_+. The spectral parameter $\mathcal{E}$ and the quasimomentum P in each νth band are connected by the *dispersion relation*

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^\nu(P, x).$$

The assumption on the potential $v(y, x)$ that the νth effective Hamiltonian (eigenvalue) of the operator $\mathcal{H}^\nu$ is simple (or does not intersect with other effective Hamiltonians at some points (p, x)) is equivalent to the assumption that, for each x, the *νth band does not stick together with the $\nu - 1$st and $\nu + 1$st bands.* Under this assumption, one can find the reduced equation describing solutions corresponding to the νth term (effective Hamiltonian)

$$H^\nu_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{E}^\nu(P(p, x), x) + p^2 - (P(p, x))^2.$$

The corresponding function $\chi^\nu_0(y, p, x)$ is expressed via the Bloch function u^ν, $u^\nu(\xi, P, x)$, by the formula

$$\chi_0 = u^\nu(\frac{y}{U}, P(p, x), x)\exp(-i\frac{P(p, x)y}{U}).$$

If $n = 1$ and $\Phi = x$, then $P = p$, which leads to the well-known fact in solid state physics: the quasimomentum becomes the momentum for the equation for electron waves in crystals. In contrast to Examples 1, 2, and 3, the effective Hamiltonian here is not a polynomial in p and the function χ_0 depends on the momentum p.

Let us write the first correction L_1 to the effective Hamiltonian. Using formula (3.16) we obtain

$$L_1 = \langle\chi_0, \frac{d\chi_0}{dt}\rangle + \langle\chi_0, (2p - \frac{\partial H}{\partial p})\nabla\chi_0\rangle + 2i\text{Re}\langle\nabla\chi_0\frac{\partial\chi_0}{\partial y}, \nabla\chi_0\rangle.$$

Note that it is possible to meet a situation in which the number of phases in the potential is greater than the dimension of the configuration space n. For instance, consider the case $m = 2$, $n = 1$. In this situation, the operator $\mathcal{H}$ is degenerate and its spectrum has a rather complicated structure. In particular, the spectrum can be an everywhere dense set on the spectral axis (the so-called devil's stair) and the multiplicity of its eigenvalues can depend on x. These problems are related to different types of complicated resonances and to problems with intersecting characteristics. Some results for the solutions of the Cauchy problem in this situation are obtained in [12, 20, 46].

Remark. Bloch electrons in a weak magnetic field and the Peierls substitution. The original Peierls substitution was first proposed for the problem with Bloch electrons in a weak magnetic field (see, e.g., [5]). Using the terminology of this paper, this problem can be stated as a spectral problem for the magnetic Schrödinger operator with the periodic electric potential:

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - A(x)\right)^2 + v(\frac{x}{\mu}), \qquad \langle \nabla, A\rangle = 0.$$

For simplicity, we restrict ourselves by simple cubic lattice, i.e., assume that $v = v(y_1, y_2, y_3)$ is 2π-periodic with respect to each variable $y_j = x_j/\mu$, $j = 1, 2, 3$. The fact that the magnetic field is weak means that $A(x)$ does not contain any irregular dependence on the parameter μ in contrast to the crystalline potential $v(\frac{x}{\mu})$. After the space regularization (4.2) with phase vector $\Phi(x) \equiv x$ similarly to (4.3), we obtain the problem with operator-valued symbol $\mathcal{H} = (1/2)(p - i\partial/\partial y - A)^2 + v(y)$. The procedure based on the formulas (4.5) leads to the problem for Bloch solutions for the operator $\mathcal{H} = -(1/2)\Delta_y + v(y)$. Let $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}^\nu(P)$, $P = (P_1, P_2, P_3)$ determine the dispersion relation for the Bloch solutions with quasimomentum P. Then, according to this subsection, $L_0^\nu \equiv H_{\text{eff}}^\nu = \mathcal{E}^\nu(p - A)$, $L_1^\nu = [\operatorname{tr}(\frac{\partial^2\mathcal{E}^\nu}{\partial p^2}\frac{\partial A}{\partial x})](p - A)$, and in (3.7) $\hat{L} = \hat{L}_0^\nu + \mu\hat{L}_1^\nu + O(\mu^2) = \mathcal{E}^\nu(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x} - A) + O(\mu^2)$ which is exactly the *Peierls substitution*. The higher order corrections look much more complicated than the leading term [47]. It seems to us that our approach allows one to calculate these corrections easier than in [47]. Semiclassical analysis of the reduced equation (3.7) reveals a very complicated and striking topology of surfaces invariant to the corresponding phase flow. The recent results and bibliography can be found in [48].

4.2 Electron-phonon interaction

As was noted in Remark 1 in Section 3.3, §3, one can consider adiabatic problems as problems containing "slightly noncommuting" operators. In the zeroth-order approximation, these operators can be substituted by "c-numbers," which allows one to determine a term. For "slightly noncommuting" operators, there are physical quantities slowly varying in time. The slightly commuting operators can generate a certain Lie algebra. In the simplest case, this Lie algebra is the Heisenberg algebra, and we can directly use the scheme and formulas proposed in §3. Sometimes, it is possible to consider the same problem from a different viewpoint, which depends on the choice of the operators. For instance, to simplify the form of the original Hamiltonian, one can use a (noncanonical) change of variables, which, in turn, leads to the replacement of the Heisenberg commutation relations by different ones. We consider such an example which can be analyzed from these different viewpoints, but since the study of problems based on non-Heisenberg commutation relations requires new nontrivial algebraic and geometric constructions, we restrict ourselves to the approach described in §3, although, from some viewpoint, the approach based on non-Heisenberg commutation relations can be more readily realized in some concrete problems.

The electron-phonon interaction is the interaction between light fermions (electrons) and heavy bosons (phonons). Here the lattice modes (bosons) are slow and the electrons (fermions) are fast. The Hamiltonian of electron-phonon interaction is (see, e.g., [49])

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \sum_n \hat{c}_n(\hat{\psi}^+_{n+1}\hat{\psi}_n + \hat{\psi}^+_n\hat{\psi}_{n+1}) + \sum_n K(\hat{x}_{n+1} - \hat{x}_n)^2 + \hat{p}^2_n/2, \tag{4.6}$$

$$[\hat{x}_n, \hat{p}_{n'}] = i\mu\delta_{nn'}, \quad \mu = \hbar/\alpha\sqrt{m_0c_0} \tag{4.7}$$

$$[\hat{\psi}^+_j, \hat{\psi}_k]_+ \equiv \hat{\psi}^+_j\hat{\psi}_k + \hat{\psi}^+_k\hat{\psi}_j = i\delta_{jk}.$$

Here m_0, c_0, K, α are physical constants; moreover, $\mu \ll 1$; the linear operators $\hat{\Psi}^+_1, \dots, \hat{\Psi}^+_M$ and $\hat{\Psi}_1, \dots, \hat{\Psi}_M$ act on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_1$, the linear operators $\hat{p}_1, \dots, \hat{p}_M$ and $\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_M$ act on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_2$. The full quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ acts on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H} = \mathbb{H}_1 \otimes \mathbb{H}_2$. The typical situation is given by the operators

$$\hat{c}_n = f(\hat{x}_{n+1} - \hat{x}_n), \tag{4.8}$$

where $f(z)$ is a smooth function; in particular, $\hat{c}_n = 1 - \alpha(\hat{x}_{n+1} - \hat{x}_n)$. Let us set $\hat{X} = (\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_N)$, $\hat{P} = (\hat{p}_1, \dots, \hat{p}_N)$, $\hat{\Psi} = (\hat{\psi}_1, \dots, \hat{\psi}_M)$, $\hat{\Psi}^+ = (\hat{\psi}^+_1, \dots, \hat{\psi}^+_M)$. In a more general case, the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}$ of electron-phonon interaction can be written as

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = \langle\hat{\Psi}^+, \mathcal{L}(\hat{X}, \hat{P})\hat{\Psi}\rangle + \Phi(\hat{X}) + \hat{P}^2/2, \tag{4.9}$$

where $\mathcal{L}(P, X)$ is a Hermitian $M \times M$ matrix with coefficients depending on X and P, and the operator $\mathcal{L}(\hat{X}, \hat{P})$ is understood in the sense of Weyl calculus (see [14, 21, 22]). To simplify the consideration, we restrict ourselves to the case in which $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_1(X) + \mathcal{L}_2(P)$; then the question about the ordering of the operators $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{P}$ does not appear. As we have just said, it is possible to develop the "operator separation of variables" based on the algebra of operators $\hat{c}_j, \hat{p}_j$ with the commutation relations

$$[\hat{p}_j, \hat{c}_k] = i\mu(\delta_{jk} - \delta_{jk+1})\hat{c}_k,$$

but here we use the standard representation $\hat{x}_j = x_j$ and $\hat{p}_j = -i\mu\partial/\partial x_j$ and close the lattice by the Born–Karman periodicity condition identifying the operators with the numbers j and $j + M$.

Denote the electron-phonon wave function by Υ and consider the stationary problem

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}}\Upsilon = \mathcal{E}\Upsilon, \quad \Upsilon \in \mathbb{H}. \tag{4.10}$$

We have an equation with operator-valued symbol which, obviously, is the operator

$$\mathcal{H}(X, P) = \langle\Psi^+, \mathcal{L}(X, P)\Psi\rangle + (\Phi(X) + P^2/2)\hat{I}_1 \tag{4.11}$$

acing on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}_1$. We also denote the identity operator acting on $\mathbb{H}_j$ by $\hat{I}_j$.

To realize the scheme of the operator separation of variables, it is necessary to find the spectrum of the operator-valued symbol $\mathcal{H}(X, P)$. A nice fact is that this spectrum can be expressed via the eigenvalues of the matrix $\mathcal{L}$. Namely, suppose that $\psi(E_j) = (\psi_1(E_j), \dots, \psi_M(E_j))$ are the eigenvectors of the matrix $\mathcal{L}(X, P)$ corresponding to its eigenvalues $E_j(X, P)$ $E_1 \leq \dots \leq E_M$ and satisfying the normalization conditions $\langle\psi(E_j), \psi(E_k)\rangle = \delta_{jk}$. Using the basis $\{\psi(E_j)\}$, one can expand the operators $\hat{\Psi}^+$ and $\hat{\Psi}$

$$\hat{\psi}^+ = \sum_{j=1}^M \psi^*(E_j)\hat{a}^+_j, \qquad \hat{\psi} = \sum_{j=1}^M \psi(E_j)\hat{a}_j. \tag{4.12}$$

The coefficients (operators) of this expansion, $\hat{a}_j^+$ and $\hat{a}_j$, are called the creation and annihilation operators [50]. They determine the operators of the number of particles $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_j = \hat{a}_j^+\hat{a}_j$. Finally, the operator-valued symbol can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}(X,P) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} E_j(X,P)\hat{\mathcal{N}}_j + \Phi(X) + P^2/2, \qquad \hat{\mathcal{N}}_j = \hat{a}_j^+\hat{a}_j.$$

From this, we find the νth effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{eff}}^{\nu}(X,P) = \sum_{j=1}^{\nu} E_j(X,P) + \Phi(X) + P^2/2, \tag{4.13}$$

and the symbols of the corresponding intertwining operators χ_0^ν:

$$\chi_0^\nu = \hat{\mathcal{N}}_1 \dots \hat{\mathcal{N}}_\nu (I - \hat{\mathcal{N}}_{\nu+1}) \dots (I - \hat{\mathcal{N}}_M) \cdot 1. \tag{4.14}$$

Let us analyze the formula for L_1. If the effective Hamiltonian H_{eff}^{ν} is degenerate or $\mathcal{L}_1(X), \mathcal{L}_2(P)$ are complex matrices, then one must use the general formula (3.16). For the case in which $\mathcal{L}_2(P) = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_1(X)$ is a real-valued matrix and its spectrum $(E_1(x), \dots, E_M(x))$ is nondegenerate, it follows from formulas (4.13) that the effective Hamiltonians are nondegenerate and H_{eff}^{ν} and χ_0^ν are real. Thus, taking into account the relations $\mathcal{H}_1 = 0$, $\left\langle \chi_0^T, \frac{d\chi_0}{dt} \right\rangle_y = \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left\langle \chi_0^T, \chi_0 \right\rangle_y = 0$, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_l} - \frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial p_l} I = 0$, we obtain

$$L_1 = 0.$$

This equality holds for the operators $\hat{c}_n$ given by formula (4.8), in particular, if $c_n = e^{x_n - x_{n-1}}$.

It was pointed out that in this case it is possible to relate problem (4.10) to the integrable Toda lattice model [51, 52]. Then this observation was used to construct its semiclassical asymptotics [53], and at the same time, commutation relations of different type were chosen.

4.3 Internal waves in ocean in a pycnocline

The next example concerns a situation in which the operator $\mathcal{H}$ is not self-adjoint, moreover, the system of equations under study differs a little from (2.2). Thus the scheme of §3 requires a slight modification.

We consider a system of hydrodynamic equations for an ideal incompressible liquid linearized on the flow with velocity U and density ρ_0. Let $x = (x_1, x_2)$ be the horizontal coordinates, z be the vertical coordinate, $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$, and ρ be perturbations of the velocity and density, Π be the pressure, $g = (0, 0, |g|)$ be the gravity acceleration. We introduce dimensionless variables and parameters by the formulas: $U = U'\omega_1\lambda$, $u = u'\omega_1\lambda$, $t = t'\omega_2$, $x = x'L$, $z = z'L$, $g = g'\omega_1^2\lambda$, $\Pi = \Pi'\omega_1^2\lambda^2$, and $\rho_0 = \rho_0'\bar{\rho}$, $\rho = \rho'\bar{\rho}$, where ω_1 is the characteristic frequency of the internal wave, λ is the characteristic wavelength, L is the characteristic distance in the horizontal direction within which the characteristics of the liquid vary, ω_2 is the average value of the Väisälä–Brunt frequency, $\bar{\rho}$ and $\omega_1^2\lambda^2$ are the characteristic values of density and pressure, and $\mu = \lambda/L = \omega_1/\omega_2 \ll 1$ is a small parameter.

In the dimensionless variables, the linearized system for waves in liquids has the form [10, 54]:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mu\rho_0\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + \mu\rho_0\langle U, \nabla\rangle u + \mu\rho_0\langle u, \nabla\rangle U + \mu\nabla\Pi + \rho g = 0, \\ \mu\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \mu\langle U, \nabla\rangle\rho + \mu\langle u, \nabla\rangle\rho_0 = 0, \\ \mu\langle \nabla, u\rangle = 0, \end{array} \right. \tag{4.15}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ is the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^3$. The difference between Eqs. (4.15) and Eq. (2.2) is that the last equation of this system contains the time-derivative.

We shall consider that the width of the picnocline $\Delta z \sim \mu$, and that the depth of its location varies at distances ~ 1, i.e., $\rho_0 = \rho_0(z/\mu - f(x), x)$ (the equation for the surface of a picnocline is $z = \mu f$). The functions $U(x) = (U_1, U_2, 0)$, $\rho_0(y, x)$, $f(x)$ are assumed to be smooth, $0 < \delta_0 < \rho_0 < c_0$ (δ_0, c_0 are constants), the square of the Väisälä–Brunt frequency $\omega_0^2 = -|g|\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y}/\rho_0$ is positive and vanishes rather fast as $|y| \to \infty$. We assume that the functions u_j and ρ decay quite fast as $|z| \to \infty$. The other boundary and initial conditions for Eqs.(4.15) are chosen in a special way and should be formulated for the corresponding reduced effective equation of adiabatic motion (3.3).

Let us introduce a new independent variable $y = z/\mu - f(x)$ and a vector with five components $\Psi(x, y, t, \mu) = (u, \rho, \Pi)$. Into the equations for the vector Ψ, we must substitute the differential operators as $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \to \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}$ and $\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \to \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$. Then, for Ψ, we obtain a system of equations containing "fast" variable y and slow variables x, t. For convenience, we multiply this system by $i = \sqrt{-1}$:

$$i\mu B\Psi_t = \mathcal{H}(\overset{2}{x}, \overset{1}{-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, y, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, \mu)\Psi(x, y, t, \mu), \qquad B = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (4.16)$$

The matrix symbols $\mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ have the form

$$\mathcal{H}_0(x, p, y, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, t) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_0\langle U, p\rangle & 0 & 0 & 0 & p_1 \\ 0 & \rho_0\langle U, p\rangle & 0 & 0 & p_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_0\langle U, p\rangle & -i|g| & -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \\ 0 & 0 & -i\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y} & \langle U, p\rangle & 0 \\ p_1 & p_2 & -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = -i\rho_0 \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial U_1}{\partial x_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial x_1} & \frac{\partial U_2}{\partial x_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -i\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial x_1} + i\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y} & -i\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial x_2} + i\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}) & \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}(i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}) & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} +$$

$$+\langle U, \nabla f\rangle B\left(i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right),$$

where $p = (p_1, p_2, 0)$. Let us show that the general scheme of the operator separation can be easily modified for this situation, although one of the equations in the system does not contain the time-derivative.

We seek the solution in the form (3.9) and assume that $\psi(x, t, \mu)$ satisfies an effective equation of the form (3.3). Then, instead of (3.11), we obtain the following relation for symbols:

$$B\chi(\overset{2}{x}, p \overset{1}{-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, y, t, \mu)L(x, p, t, \mu) + i\mu B\chi_t(x, p, t, y, \mu) -$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\overset{2}{x}, p \overset{1}{-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, y, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, t, \mu)\chi(x, p, y, t, \mu) = 0.$$

Expanding this relation into a series with respect to a small parameter μ, instead of the eigenvalue problem, we obtain the problem for the spectral parameter H_{eff} of the operator sheaf $(\mathcal{H}_0 - BH_{\text{eff}})$,

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_0(x,p,y,-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y},t) - BH_{\text{eff}}(x,p,t)\right)\chi_0(x,p,y,t) = 0,$$

and the following equation for the corrections χ_1 and L_1:

$$\left(\mathcal{H}_0(x,p,y,-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y},t) - BH_{\text{eff}}(x,p,t)\right)\chi_1 = F_1 - \mathcal{H}_1\chi_0 + B\chi_0 L_1, \qquad F_1 = \hat{\mathcal{D}}\chi_0 \tag{4.17}$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}} = iB\frac{\partial}{\partial t} + i\sum_j\left[\frac{\partial\mathcal{H}_0}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j} - B\frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial x^j}\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\right] = iB\frac{d}{dt} + i\sum_j\frac{\partial(\mathcal{H}_0 - BH_{\text{eff}})}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}.$$

We assume that the chosen spectral parameter $H_{\text{eff}}(x,p,t)$ is nondegenerate, so χ_0 is a vector with five components $\{\chi_{0j}\}$, $j = 1,\dots,5$. Then the solution of the problem for the operator sheaf has the form

$$\begin{cases} \chi_{01} = i\frac{p_1}{p^2}\frac{\partial w(y,x,\alpha)}{\partial y}, \\ \chi_{02} = i\frac{p_2}{p^2}\frac{\partial w(y,x,\alpha)}{\partial y}, \\ \chi_{03} = w\left(y,x,\alpha\right), \\ \chi_{04} = i\frac{\partial\rho_0}{\partial y}\frac{w(y,x,\alpha)}{\Lambda}, \\ \chi_{05} = -i\rho_0\frac{\Lambda}{p^2}\frac{\partial w(y,x,\alpha)}{\partial y}. \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

Here $\Lambda = \langle U,p\rangle - H_{\text{eff}}(x,p)$, $\alpha = \Lambda^2/p^2$, $p^2 = p_1^2 + p_2^2$, $w(y,x,\alpha)$ is an eigenfunction of the problem

$$\frac{1}{\rho_0(y,x)}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\rho_0(y,x)\frac{\partial}{\partial y}w(y,x,\alpha) + \frac{\omega_0^2(y,x)}{\alpha}w(y,x,\alpha) = \varkappa(x,\alpha)w(y,x,\alpha),$$

and $H_{\text{eff}}(x,p,t)$ is a solution of the algebraic equation

$$\varkappa\left(x, \frac{(\langle U,p\rangle - H_{\text{eff}}(x,p))^2}{p^2}\right) = p^2.$$

We choose an eigenvalue $\varkappa$ and consider the corresponding function $H_{\text{eff}}(x,p)$. In general, this function is multi-valued; we fix one of its branches and assume that this branch is a smooth function of x, p.

The first correction L_1 is found from the solvability condition for Eq. (4.17). Its right-hand part must be orthogonal to the kernel of the adjoint operator $(\mathcal{H} - BH_{\text{eff}})^*$. We denote a function from its kernel by χ_0^*. Then the first correction to the effective Hamiltonian is

$$L_1(x,p,t) = \frac{1}{\langle\chi_0^*, B\chi_0\rangle}\left\langle\chi_0^*, \left[\mathcal{H}_1 - iB\frac{d}{dt} - i\sum_j\frac{\partial(\mathcal{H}_0 - BH_{\text{eff}})}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\right]\chi_0\right\rangle_y.$$

To determine χ_0^*, we note that the construction of the operator adjoint to $(\mathcal{H}_0 - BH_{\text{eff}})$ is equivalent to the replacement $|g| \leftrightarrow -\partial\rho_0/\partial y$. This gives

$$\chi_{0k}^* = \chi_{0k}, \quad k = 1,2,3,5, \quad \chi_{04}^* = -i|g|\frac{w(y,x,\alpha)}{\Lambda}.$$

Using these relations, we obtain

$$\langle \chi_0^*, B\chi_0\rangle_y = \frac{1}{p^2}\int \rho_0 \left|\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}\right|^2 dy + \int \rho_0 \left|w\right|^2 dy + \int \frac{\rho_0\omega_0^2}{\Lambda^2}|w|^2 dy, \tag{4.19}$$

$$\langle \chi_0^*, \mathcal{H}_1\chi_0\rangle_y = -\frac{i}{p^4}\sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \frac{\partial U_j}{\partial x_k} p_j p_k \int \rho_0 \left|\frac{\partial w}{\partial y}\right|^2 dy - \tag{4.20}$$

$$-i\frac{\Lambda}{p^4}\langle p, \nabla f\rangle \left(\int \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\rho_0 \frac{\partial w}{\partial y}\right) dy + c.c.\right) - i\frac{1}{p^2\Lambda}\int \left\langle p, \nabla\rho_0 - \nabla f \frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y}\right\rangle \bar{w}\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y} dy +$$

$$+\frac{i}{p^2}\langle U, \nabla f\rangle \int \rho_0 \frac{\partial \bar{w}}{\partial y}\frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial y^2} dy + i\langle U, \nabla f\rangle \int \rho_0 \bar{w}\frac{\partial w}{\partial y} dy - i\langle U, \nabla f\rangle \frac{|g|}{\Lambda^2}\int \bar{w}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\frac{\partial \rho_0}{\partial y} w\right) dy.$$

Using formulas (4.19)-(4.20) we can calculate the first correction L_1. We don't give here the explicit formula for L_1 in the general case because of its bulk.

4.4 Electromagnetic waveguides, integral optics, surface gravity water waves and shells.

The electromagnetic wave propagation in waveguides is described by wave equation containing the second time-derivative. In the two-dimensional case, we have a situation similar to that considered in Example 2, §2. One can easily generalize the scheme of §3 to this situation. The change consists in the following: instead of $i\mu\psi_t$, one must write the second time-derivative $\mu^2\psi_{tt}$ in the left-hand side of (3.7). The same change allows one to consider the three-dimensional waveguide problems. But now it is possible to consider waves in thin films (integral optics) or in thin tubes. The stationary variant of such equations is the Helmholtz equation

$$(\Delta + k^2 n(x))\Psi = 0 \tag{4.21}$$

with the refractive index $n(x)$ and, e.g., the Dirichlet conditions $\Psi = 0$ on the boundary of the film or the tube. The parameter μ characterizes the ratio between the transverse and longitudinal dimensions of the waveguide; one can apply the adiabatic approximation if the boundary of the waveguide changes slowly. V. P. Maslov considered problems of this type in 1958 in [55], where he constructed asymptotic solutions and predicted the possibility of the construction of one-mode resonators by means of the waveguide geometry. Later on, problems of this type were considered in more general situations in optics and quantum mechanics (see, e.g., [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 56, 57, 58, 59]).

The consideration of the Helmholtz equation is very similar to the consideration of the stationary Schrödinger equation. In what follows, we consider the Schrödinger equation in a quantum waveguide in a more complicated situation.

More complicated examples similar to planar waveguides (thin films) lead to problems about the wave propagations in shells. Instead of the wave equations, one must consider the Lamé equations in elastic theory. The operator separation of variables can also be used in such problems, but the study of these problems is far beyond the aim of this paper.

A more exotic example of the operator separation of variables is given by the theory of surface gravity water waves over an uneven bottom (see, e.g., [60]). Actually, this problem is the linearization of the problem with free boundary and the anzatz (3.5) was first used in this situation [11]. The operator approach is discussed in detail in [11, 21, 22, 61], so we do not consider this problem here.

4.5 Nanophysics: wave propagation in nanofilms.

The two subsequent examples (quantum waves in nanofilms and nanotubes) are probably the simplest ones in adiabatic problems. An interest in these problems appeared recently because of great progress in nanotechnologies. It seems that most of the results described below, as well as many recent mathematical results (e.g., [31, 32, 33, 36, 57, 58, 59]), did not appear many years ago, because there was no deep physical interest in the corresponding problems. Now the question is to study concrete applied problems. Needless to say that the representation of the solution in the form appropriate for practical analysis is an additional and sometimes nontrivial problem (even in the case of nanofilms and nanotubes with simple structure, e.g., without branching). So below we discuss some specific properties concerning quantum waveguides, present the effective equation of adiabatic (longitudinal) motion in thin films and tubes, and briefly touch upon only a few possible applications of the general theory to problems of quantum waves in nanotubes with spin taken into account. The results of this subsection represent the particular case of the general results concerning quantum wave propagation in thin films taking spin into account. These more general results are obtained together with J. Brüning [62].

Thin crystalline films of width $\sim$ 10nm (a few monoatomic layers), synthesized recently, give a more complicated example of quantum waveguide. Such a film is a waveguide for a quasiparticle with charge e propagating along the film, and we can affect this particle by means of an external electromagnetic field. In reality, a quasi-particle has spin, but we shall not consider spin effects for nanofilms.

The nanofilm width $d_0 \sim 1\,\mathrm{nm}$ ($10\,\text{Å}$) is comparable with the de Broglie wavelength $\lambda = 2\pi/k_F \sim 1\,\mathrm{nm}$ of an electron with energy of the order of the Fermi energy $\varepsilon_F \sim 1\,\mathrm{eV}$. This circumstance leads to the following effect of "dimensional quantization" of low-dimensional systems: the domain of the wave function localization in the normal direction to the film has dimensions $\sim \lambda$, and the energy corresponding to the motion in this direction is quantized. Therefore, the total three-dimensional problem of describing the quantum states can be divided into several reduced problems (on "subbands of dimensional quantization") already with two-dimensional quantum effective Hamiltonians (along the film surface), which, in the end, allows one to obtain a sufficiently explicit description of these states by using asymptotic formulas.

The film boundaries play an important role in the future constructions. A natural idea is to simulate the boundaries of the film by means of the Dirichlet conditions or "rigid walls" for the wave function. But it is more convenient to simulate by using the so-called "soft walls." Boundaries of this type are related to the physical mechanism of confinement of electrons near the physical film. The confinement appears as a result of the electrostatic interaction between the film and the quasi-particle. One usually simulates this interaction by introducing a confinement potential v_{int} in the direction normal to the film. The potential v_{int} increases very fast near the imaginary boundaries of the film (the "walls"). Thus the wave function decays very fast outside the film and the confinement potential v_{int} replaces the "rigid" walls simulated by the Dirichlet conditions. From the "mechanical" viewpoint, the confinement potential represents the interaction with imaginary walls. The same idea is used in simulation of nanotubes. We shall present the corresponding formulas somewhat later.

The effective dynamics of quantum states in the approximation of the strong coupling method is determined by the Schrödinger equation:

$$i\hbar\Psi_t = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi, \qquad \widehat{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{P}}^2}{2m} + v_{\mathrm{int}}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathbf{r}, t), \tag{4.22}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{P}} = -i\hbar\nabla - (e/c)\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}, t)$, $e = -e_0$ is the charge of electron, m is the effective mass of quasi-particle, c is the velocity of light, and $(v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}, t), \mathbf{A})$ are the potentials of external electromagnetic field. We shall consider a space-uniform time-dependent magnetic field $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}(t)$.

The characteristic value of the transverse energy $\varepsilon_\perp$ in the tube can be found from the uncertainty relation: since the "transverse" momentum is $\sim \hbar/d_0$, we have $\varepsilon_\perp \sim \hbar^2/(md_0^2)$. Let us introduce the characteristic "longitudinal" length l_0. Depending on the problem considered, l_0 can be, for instance, the radius of curvature of the film or the radius of the solution localization area, etc. We assume that $l_0 \gg d_0$. We introduce the magnetic length $l_M = \sqrt{\hbar c/\bigl(e|\mathbf{H}|\bigr)}$, the magnetic field quantum $\Phi_0 = 2\pi\hbar c/e$, and the dimensionless magnetic field as the number of magnetic flux quanta passing through the characteristic area $l_0 d_0$: $\mathbf{H}' = l_0 d_0/{l_M}^2 \cdot \mathbf{H}/|\mathbf{H}| = 2\pi l_0 d_0 \cdot \mathbf{H}/\Phi_0$. We introduce the new variables $\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{r}/l_0$, the dimensionless time $t' = t/T$, $T = md_0 l_0/\hbar$, the dimensionless potentials $v'_{\text{int}} = v_{\text{int}}/\varepsilon_\perp$, $v'_{\text{ext}} = v_{\text{ext}}/\varepsilon_\perp$, $\mathbf{A}' = ed_0(\hbar c)^{-1}\mathbf{A}$, and the dimensionless constant $\alpha' = \hbar\alpha/d_0^2$ and divide both sides of Eq. (4.22) by the energy of transverse motion ε_0. Below, we shall omit the primes. Then the equation describing the motion of a quantum particle (or a quasi-particle) in a quasi-two-dimensional crystal takes the form

$$i\mu\Psi_t = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi, \qquad \widehat{\mathcal{H}} = 1/2(-i\mu\nabla - \mathbf{A})^2 + v_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{r}, t). \tag{4.23}$$

The fact that we consider the last equation in a film is determined by the boundary conditions. We shall assume that the film is determined by some smooth surface Γ. This means that Eq. (4.23) holds and the boundary conditions are formulated in some neighborhood of Γ. It is convenient to use the special curvilinear coordinates for the description of these conditions, as well as for all future investigations.

Curvilinear coordinates. By $x = (x^1, x^2)$ we denote the (dimensionless) local coordinates on the surface Γ, then each point $\mathbf{r}$ in a neighborhood of Γ can be determined by three values (x^1, x^2, y), where y is the distance between the point $\mathbf{r}$ and its projection $R(x) \in \Gamma$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{R}(x) + y\mathbf{n}(x),$$

where, as above, $\mathbf{n}(x)$ is a unit normal vector on Γ. Note that, in general, the coordinates x^1, x^2 are not orthogonal, but always $\langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{n} \rangle = 1$, $\langle \mathbf{n}, \partial_i \mathbf{R} \rangle = 0$, $i = 1, 2$. Thus the metric tensor is

$$G_{ab} = \begin{Vmatrix} \gamma_{ij} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{Vmatrix}, \quad G = \det G_{ab}, \quad a, b = 1, 2, 3, \tag{4.24}$$

where $\gamma_{ij} = \langle \partial_i \mathbf{r}, \partial_j \mathbf{r} \rangle$, $\gamma = \det \gamma_{ij}$, $i, j = 1, 2$, and $G = \gamma$. Now let us present the components of the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ in the coordinates (x^1, x^2, y). We choose the symmetric form of the vector potential $\mathbf{A} = 1/2[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{r}]$. Hence the vector potential satisfies the Lorentz gauge: $\partial A^a/\partial r^a = 0$. From now on, it is convenient to use the Einstein notation and the summation rule.

Soft and rigid walls. Using the curvilinear coordinates, one can consider an "empty" film with "rigid" walls: $v_{\text{int}} = 0$, $\Psi|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$ (the Dirichlet condition) or a film with "soft" walls: $v_{\text{int}} \neq 0$, $\Psi(x, y) \in L_2(y)$ at each x. However, the last definition requires $v_{\text{int}}(x, y)$ to be identically defined in the entire $\mathbb{R}^3$. The last condition is too strong, since $\Psi(x, y)$ is exponentially small for $y \gg \mu$ and any conditions on the function Ψ in this region affect its behavior negligibly. To be definite, in what follows, we assume that $\Psi(x, y)|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$. The "empty" film with "rigid" walls can be considered as the limit of soft walls described by the potential rapidly increasing near the boundary. As an example, let us consider the potential $v_{\mathrm{int}}(x, y') = (y'/D(x))^{2m}$, $y' = y/\mu$, $m > 0$. As $m \to \infty$, we have $v_{\mathrm{int}}(x, y < d(x)) \to 0$ and $v_{\mathrm{int}}(x, y > d(x)) \to \infty$.

Operator-valued symbol in a nanofilm. It is well known that the use of the function $\Psi' = \Psi G^{1/4}$ instead of the function Ψ can significantly simplify the corresponding calculations. Substituting the function $\Psi = G^{-1/4}\Psi'$ into Eq. (4.23), we obtain the following equation for the function Ψ':

$$i\mu\Psi'_t = \widehat{\mathcal{H}}'\Psi', \qquad \widehat{\mathcal{H}}' = G^{1/4}\widehat{\mathcal{H}}G^{-1/4}. \tag{4.25}$$

Using the formula $G^{1/4}\Delta G^{-1/4} = G^{ab}\partial_a\partial_b + G^{ab}_{,a}\partial_b + G^{-1/4}\partial_a\big(G^{1/2}G^{ab}\partial_b(G^{-1/4})\big)$, we obtain

$$\begin{gathered}\widehat{\mathcal{H}}' = \frac{1}{2}G^{ab}\hat{p}_a\hat{p}_b - \frac{i\mu}{2}G^{ab}_{,a}\hat{p}_b - \frac{\mu^2}{2}\frac{1}{G^{1/4}}\partial_a\left[G^{1/2}G^{ab}\partial_b\left(\frac{1}{G^{1/4}}\right)\right] - \\ -G^{ab}A_a\hat{p}_b - \frac{i\mu}{4}G^{ab}A_a\partial_b(\ln G) + \frac{1}{2}G^{ab}A_aA_b + v_{\mathrm{ext}}(x, y, t) + v_{\mathrm{int}}(x, y/\mu).\end{gathered}$$

We want to study solutions to Eq. (4.25) that have only a few oscillations in the transverse direction. From the physical viewpoint, it is clear that, in general, the nontrivial behavior of such solutions should be determined by two-dimensional effective equations of adiabatic motion (3.7) on the surface Γ in a neighborhood of the physical film. Recall that our goal is to find these reduced equations corresponding to solutions with different numbers of transverse oscillations. As we have different scales in the transverse and longitudinal direction, it is natural to use the variable $y' = y/\mu$ instead of y. To simplify the notation, we omit the prime. Then the operator $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}'$ in Eq. (4.25) is

$$\begin{gathered}\widehat{\mathcal{H}}' = \frac{\gamma^{ij}}{2}(\hat{p}_i\hat{p}_j - 2A_i\hat{p}_j + A_iA_j) + \frac{1}{2}(\hat{p}_y^2 - 2A_y\hat{p}_y + A_y^2) + v_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathbf{r}, t) + v_{\mathrm{int}}(x, y) - \\ -\frac{i\mu}{2}\gamma^{ij}_{,i}\hat{p}_j - \frac{i\mu}{4}\gamma^{ij}A_i\partial_j(\ln\gamma) - \frac{i}{4}A_y\partial_y(\ln\gamma) - \\ -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\frac{1}{\gamma^{1/4}}\partial_i\left[\gamma^{1/2}\gamma^{ij}\partial_j\left(\frac{1}{\gamma^{1/4}}\right)\right] - \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\gamma^{1/4}}\partial_y\left[\gamma^{1/2}\partial_y\left(\frac{1}{\gamma^{1/4}}\right)\right],\end{gathered} \tag{4.26}$$

where $A_i = \langle\partial_i\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{A}\rangle$ and $A_y = \langle\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}\rangle$. Eq. (4.25), with the Hamiltonian determined by formula (4.26), is the object of our future study.

Using these formulas, we find the first and second terms of the expansion of the symbol of operator $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}'$:

$$\mathcal{H}'_0\left(x, p, y, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, t\right) = \frac{1}{2}g^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\mathcal{P}_j + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\mathcal{P}}_y^2 + v_{\mathrm{ext}}\big(\mathbf{R}(x), t\big) + v_{\mathrm{int}}(x, y) \tag{4.27}$$

$$\begin{gathered}\mathcal{H}'_1\left(x, p, y, -i\frac{\partial}{\partial y}, t\right) = \frac{1}{2}y\gamma_1^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\mathcal{P}_j - yg^{ij}\mathcal{P}_iA_j^1 + \langle\nabla v_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x), t), y\mathbf{n}\rangle - \\ -i\left(\frac{1}{2}g^{ij}_{,i}p_j + \frac{1}{4}g^{ij}A_i^0\partial_j(\ln g) + \frac{1}{4}A_y^0[\partial_y(\ln\gamma)]_{y=0}\right),\end{gathered} \tag{4.28}$$

where $p = (p_1, p_2)$, $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_0 + \mu y\mathbf{A}_1$, $\mathbf{A}_0 = 1/2[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{R}]$, $\mathbf{A}_1 = 1/2[\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{n}]$, $A_i = A_i^0 + \mu yA_i^1 + O(\mu^2)$, $A_i^0 = \langle\partial_i\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{A}_0\rangle$, $A_i^1 = \langle\partial_i\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{A}_1\rangle + \langle\partial_i\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_0\rangle$, $A_y = A_y^0 + \mu yA_y^1 + O(\mu^2)$, $A_y^0 = \langle\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_0\rangle$, $A_y^1 = \langle\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_1\rangle = 0$, $\mathcal{P}_i = p_i - A_i^0$, and $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_y = p_y - A_y^0$.

To describe the so-called slow modes, we need to compute $\mathcal{H}'_2$ under the assumption that $\mathcal{P}_i = 0$, $v_{\mathrm{ext}} = 0$, and $\partial\mathbf{H}/\partial t = 0$. We obtain

$$\mathcal{G}(x) = -\frac{(\varkappa_1 - \varkappa_2)^2}{8} - \frac{1}{2g^{1/4}}\partial_i\left[g^{1/2}g^{ij}\partial_j\left(\frac{1}{g^{1/4}}\right)\right] \tag{4.29}$$

This term is independent of y and $\hat{p}_y$ and contains only geometric characteristics of the embedding (the first summand) and the limiting manifold (the second summand). We call it a *geometric potential.*

Effective Hamiltonians of longitudinal motion. Now we present χ^ν_0 and the effective "adiabatic" Hamiltonians H^ν_{eff}. The index ν enumerates the Hamiltonians H^ν_{eff} which, in our problem, is called the effective adiabatic Hamiltonian on the ν-th subband of the size quantization. Substituting the function $\chi^\nu_0 = \exp(iy\langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_0\rangle)w^\nu$ into Eq. (3.12) with $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}'_0$, we obtain

$$H^\nu_{\text{eff}}(p,x,t) = \frac{1}{2}g^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\mathcal{P}_j + v_{\text{ext}}\big(\mathbf{R}(x),t\big) + \varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x), \qquad \chi_0 = \exp(iy\langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_0\rangle)w^\nu. \tag{4.30}$$

where $w^\nu(x,y)$ and $\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x)$ are the respective eigenfunction and eigenvalue of the following problem:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + v_{\text{int}}(x,y)\right)w^\nu(x,y) = \varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x)w^\nu(x,y), \quad w^\nu(x,Y_1(x)) = w^\nu(x,Y_2(x)) = 0. \tag{4.31}$$

It is well known that the spectrum of this problem is nondegenerate, thus the symbols L and χ^ν are scalar functions. For the model potential $v_{\text{int}}(x,y) = (y/D(x))^{2m}$, $m > 0$ considered in item 2, we obtain $\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x) = (d(0)/d(x))^2\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(0)$, where $d(x) = D(x)^{\frac{m}{m+1}}d(0)$ is the dispersion of the state with energy $\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x)$. Assuming that the width of the film is proportional to $d(x)$, we conclude that $D(x)^{\frac{m}{m+1}}$ is the coefficient of homothety. As $m \to \infty$, this coefficient tends to $D(x)$. So we obtain the natural result stating that, in the model of empty film with rigid walls, the width of the film is equal to the distance between the walls.

Let us present the first correction μL_1 in an expansion of the symbol of the effective Hamiltonian of longitudinal motion. It is given by formula (3.16).

Using the formula for χ^ν_0 and the expansion of the gauge condition $\partial_i(\gamma^{ij}A_j) + 1/2\gamma^{ij}A_i\partial_j(\ln\gamma) + \partial_y A_y + 1/2A_y\partial_y(\ln\gamma) = 0$ with respect to $y = \mu y'$, it is easy to obtain the relations

$$\langle w^\nu, \partial_j w^\nu\rangle_y = 0, \quad \left\langle \chi^\nu_0, \frac{\partial\chi^\nu_0}{\partial t}\right\rangle_y = iY\left\langle \mathbf{n}, \frac{\partial\mathbf{A}_0}{\partial t}\right\rangle, \quad \left\langle \chi^\nu_0, \frac{\partial H_{\text{eff}}}{\partial p_j}\frac{\partial\chi^\nu_0}{\partial x^j}\right\rangle_y = iYg^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\partial_j\left\langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_0\right\rangle,$$

where $Y = \langle \chi^\nu_0, y\chi^\nu_0\rangle_y$, and

$$\begin{gathered} Yg^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\langle\partial_j\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{A}_1\rangle = -Yg^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\left\langle \mathbf{n}, \partial_j\mathbf{A}_0\right\rangle = 1/2\langle\mathbf{H}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\rangle, \\ \partial_i(g^{ij}A^0_j) + \frac{1}{2}g^{ij}A^0_i\partial_j(\ln g) + A^0_y[\partial_y(\ln\gamma)]_{y=0} = 0, \quad g^{ij}_{,i}p_j - \partial_i(g^{ij}A^0_j) = \partial_i(g^{ij}\mathcal{P}_j). \end{gathered} \tag{4.32}$$

From this, we find

$$L_1 = -Y\alpha^i_j g^{jk}\mathcal{P}_i\mathcal{P}_k - \big\langle \mathbf{E}\big(\mathbf{R}(x),t\big), Y\mathbf{n}\big\rangle - \langle\mathbf{H}, \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\rangle - \frac{i}{2}\partial_i(g^{ij}\mathcal{P}_j), \tag{4.33}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = [Y\mathbf{n}, \boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}}]$, $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{P}} = g^{ij}\mathcal{P}_i\partial_j\mathbf{R}$, and $\mathbf{E} = -\nabla v_{\text{ext}} - T(\partial\mathbf{A}_0/\partial t)$. We shall see below that the correction L_2 is important in the construction of the leading term of the asymptotic solution to the effective equation of adiabatic (longitudinal) motion only under the assumptions $\mathcal{P}_i = 0$, $v_{\text{ext}} = 0$, and $\partial\mathbf{H}/\partial t = 0$. In this case, it coincides with the "geometric" potential $\mathcal{G}(x)$ (4.29).

4.6 Nanophysics: wave dynamics in nanotubes

The Pauli operator. Lengthy molecules consisting of a great many atoms situated on cylinder-type spatial surfaces are called *nanotubes* [63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70]. The surface of such tubes can have some additional internal torsion. The nanotube diameter $d_0 \sim 1\,\mathrm{nm}$ ($10\,\text{Å}$) is comparable with the de Broglie wavelength $\lambda = 2\pi/k_F \sim 1\,\mathrm{nm}$ of an electron with energy of the order of the Fermi energy $\varepsilon_F \sim 1\,\mathrm{eV}$, and the nanotube characteristic length l_0 is significantly larger than d_0.

In the approximation of the strong coupling method, the wave functions in nanotubes are determined by the nonrelativistic one-particle Hamiltonian, i.e., by the Pauli operator with the spin-orbit interaction taken into account:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{H}} = \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{P}}^2}{2m} + v_{\mathrm{int}}(\mathbf{r}) + v_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathbf{r},t) - \frac{e\hbar}{2mc}\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{H}\rangle + \widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathrm{SO}}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{P}} = -i\hbar\nabla - \frac{e}{c}\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r},t). \tag{4.34}$$

Here $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the radius vector of a point in a neighborhood of the tube, $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathrm{SO}}$ is the operator of interaction of the electron spin with the electric field of the crystal [71]: $\widehat{\mathcal{H}}_{\mathrm{SO}} = \alpha \left\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \left[\nabla v_{\mathrm{int}}, \widehat{\mathbf{P}}\right] \right\rangle$, and α is the constant of spin-orbit interaction. This Hamiltonian differs from that in a nanofilm (4.22) only by the presence of terms describing the spin effects. Thus, all the notation is the same.

In this section we consider some of results published in [72, 73, 74].

Curvilinear coordinates in tubes. As in the case of thin films, it is convenient to perform all arguments by using a special system of curvilinear coordinates. We assume that the tube axis (the curve) γ is given by the equation $\mathbf{r} = l_0\mathbf{R}(x)$, $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, where $\mathbf{R}(x)$ is a smooth vector function and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is a natural parameter on γ (the tube length is counted off from a certain point x^*), $|\partial_x \mathbf{R}(x)| = 1$, $\partial_x = \partial/\partial x$. If $|\partial_x^2 \mathbf{R}| \neq 0$, it is determined the Frenet trihedron. The curvature $k(x) = |\partial_x^2\mathbf{R}|$ and the torsion $\varkappa(x)$ of the curve γ are connected by the Frenet trihedron $\left\{\partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{n} = \partial_x^2\mathbf{R}/|\partial_x^2\mathbf{R}|, \mathbf{b} = [\partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{n}]\right\}$ at each point x by formulas $\partial_x\mathbf{n} = -\varkappa\mathbf{b} - k\partial_x\mathbf{R}$ and $\partial_x\mathbf{b} = \varkappa\mathbf{n}$.

By $\Pi(x)$ we denote the plane intersecting the tube axis at the point $\mathbf{R}(x)$ orthogonally to the axis; the section of the tube by this plane (the area in $\Pi(x)$) we denote by $\Omega(x)$, the boundary of $\Omega(x)$ we denote by $\partial\Omega(x)$. Then the tube is the union of areas $\Omega(x)$, and its boundary is the union of $\partial\Omega(x)$. The "physical meaning" of the boundary $\partial\Omega(x)$ and of the boundary conditions will be discussed later. We introduce dimensionless coordinates (x, y_1, y_2) determined by the relations $\mathbf{r} = l_0\mathbf{R}(x) + \mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{y} = d_0y_1\mathbf{n}_1(x) + d_0y_2\mathbf{n}_2(x)$, where $\{\mathbf{n}_1(x), \mathbf{n}_2(x)\}$ is the basis in the plane $\Pi(x)$.

If we put $\mathbf{n}_1 = \mathbf{n}$, $\mathbf{n}_2 = \mathbf{b}$, then the coordinates thus introduced will be nonorthogonal. It is convenient to introduce orthogonal coordinates (see [75, 76]). First, let $\{\mathbf{n}_1(x), \mathbf{n}_2(x)\}$ be a certain orthonormal basis in the plane $\Pi(x)$ smoothly depending on x (in general, this basis does not coincide with $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{b}$); and let $\theta(x)$ be the angle between the vectors $\mathbf{n}$ and $\mathbf{n}_1$. Then, along with the torsion $\varkappa$, we can introduce an "effective torsion" $\varkappa_{\mathrm{eff}} = -\langle\partial_x\mathbf{n}_1, \mathbf{n}_2\rangle = \varkappa - \partial_x\theta$. Choosing the angle $\theta(x)$ (along with $\{\mathbf{n}_1(x), \mathbf{n}_2(x)\}$) so that $\partial_x\theta = \varkappa$, we let $\varkappa_{\mathrm{eff}}$ be zero. The coordinates thus constructed are orthogonal (around the tube axis, where they are specified). The components of the metric tensor g_{ij}, $i, j = \{x, y_1, y_2\}$ in these coordinates are determined as follows: $g_{00} = G = (1 - k\langle\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{n}\rangle)^2$, $g_{11} = g_{22} = 1$, and $g_{ij} = 0, i \neq j$. Everywhere below we shall use these coordinates. All formulas obtained below are valid in the case of a straight axis if we set $k(x) = 0$ and $\varkappa(x) = 0$. If $k(x) \neq 0$, then y_1 and y_2 are the coordinates only in the area where $1 - k\langle\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{n}\rangle > 0$. It follows from the considerations about the tube curvature given below that these coordinates are determined in the area of the tube axis under study.

Boundary conditions and geometry of nanotubes. As in the case of a nanofilm, the “surface” of a nanotube can be simulated by “rigid” and “soft” walls. The rigid walls are determined by the imaginary surface of the tube and the Dirichlet conditions on this surface. The soft walls are simulated by an appropriate choice of the crystal potential $v_{\text{int}}(y,x)$ rapidly increasing while approaching the imaginary surface of the tube and creating a potential well where the electron wave function is localized. Outside this well, the wave function is exponentially small. We shall consider tubes whose cross-section by the plane $\mathbf{\Pi}(x)$ rotates with respect to the basis $\bigl\{\mathbf{n}_1(x),\mathbf{n}_2(x)\bigr\}$ in which the metric tensor is diagonal, and simultaneously expands in the plane $x=\text{const}$ with respect to the point $\mathbf{R}(x)$. We define the tube chirality as follows: we fix a cross-section Ω_{x^*} for some $x^*\in\gamma$ and assume that, at a point $x\neq x^*$, the cross-section Ω_x is obtained from Ω_{x^*} by a turn through an angle $\Phi(x)$ (i.e., through an “angle of internal torsion” with respect to the basis $\bigl\{\mathbf{n}_1(x),\mathbf{n}_2(x)\bigr\}$) and by expanding by a factor $D(x)$.

The domain $\Omega(x)$ can be introduced as a multiply connected domain, for example, in the form of a circular or an elliptic annulus. The adequacy of this representation depends on the form of the crystal potential in a concrete nanotube. If the domain $\Omega(x)$ is simply connected, then, in the physical literature, such a nanotube is called a “quantum wire” [34, 35].

Operator-valued symbol. The way of introducing dimensionless variables in a nanotube is the same as in the previous Example 4.5. It is convenient to pick out the factor $G^{-1/4}$ from the wave function Ψ, where G is the determinant of the metric tensor in the variables (x,y_1,y_2), i.e., to substitute $\Psi=G^{-1/4}\Psi'$ into the original equation. Then the function Ψ' satisfies the equation $i\mu\Psi'_t=\hat{\mathcal{H}}'\Psi'$, $\hat{\mathcal{H}}'=G^{1/4}\mathcal{H}G^{-1/4}$. In what follows, we shall use the wave function Ψ' and the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}'$. After some transformations, the quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}'$ takes the standard form (2.2) with the operator-valued symbol

$$\mathcal{H}'=\mathcal{H}'_0+\mu\mathcal{H}'_1+\mu^2(\mathcal{G}(x)+\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}'_2)+O(\mu^3),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{H}'_0=\tfrac{\mathcal{P}_0^2}{2}+v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x),t)+\textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{2}\tfrac{\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_j^2}{2}+v_{\text{int}}(x,y),\\
&\mathcal{H}'_1=-1/2\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{H}\rangle\hat{l}+ik/2\langle\mathbf{n},\mathbf{A}_0\rangle+\Bigl(k\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{n}\rangle\mathcal{P}_0-1/2\langle\mathbf{y}_\perp,\mathbf{H}\rangle\Bigr)p+\\
&+\Bigl\langle\nabla v_{\text{ext}}\bigl(\mathbf{R}(x),t\bigr)+1/2[\mathbf{A}_0,\mathbf{H}],\mathbf{y}\Bigr\rangle-1/2\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma},\mathbf{H}\rangle+\mu^{-1}\alpha\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma},\hat{\mathbf{M}}\rangle,
\end{aligned}\tag{4.35}$$

and we introduced the notation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}_0=p-\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{A}_0\rangle,\quad \widehat{\mathcal{P}}_j=-i\partial/\partial y_j-\langle\mathbf{n}_j,\mathbf{A}_0\rangle,\quad j=1,2,\\
&\hat{l}=i(y_2\partial/\partial y_1-y_1\partial/\partial y_2),\quad \mathbf{y}_\perp=[\mathbf{y},\partial_x\mathbf{R}]=y_1\mathbf{n}_2-y_2\mathbf{n}_1,\mathbf{A}_0=1/2\bigl[\mathbf{H}(t),\mathbf{R}(x)\bigr],\\
&\hat{\mathbf{M}}=\partial_x\mathbf{R}\left(\tfrac{\partial v_{\text{int}}}{\partial y_1}\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_2-\tfrac{\partial v_{\text{int}}}{\partial y_2}\widehat{\mathcal{P}}_1\right)+\mathbf{n}_1\tfrac{\partial v_{\text{int}}}{\partial y_2}\mathcal{P}_0-\mathbf{n}_2\tfrac{\partial v_{\text{int}}}{\partial y_1}\mathcal{P}_0.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.36}$$

For the symbol $\mathcal{H}'_2$, we present only its “geometric” part $\mathcal{G}(x)=-k^2/8$, the “remainder” $\widetilde{\mathcal{H}}'_2=\mathcal{H}'_2-\mathcal{G}$ is a polynomial with respect to the momentum $\mathcal{P}_0$ and the components of the magnetic field $\mathbf{H}(t)$ with zero constant term and with coefficients smoothly depending on (x,y). In what follows, we shall see that the explicit form of this “remainder” is not necessary for the construction of the leading term of asymptotic solutions to the effective equation of adiabatic (longitudinal) motion.

The boundary conditions (rigid and soft walls) defining the nanotube are similar to those in the case of a nanofilm. The corresponding change will be discussed somewhat later.

Reduction to equations on the tube axis and the adiabatic Hamiltonian. Now we want to use the scheme of §3 and to find the symbol L of the effective equation of adiabatic motion (along the tube axis). This case is characterized by the fact that the reduced equation contains a single spatial variable. Thus, it is natural immediately to separate the factor $\exp(i\int_{x^*}^{x}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{A}_0\rangle dx/\mu)$ in the wave function. This separation takes the extended momentum operator $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ into the "short" operator $\hat{p}=-i\mu\partial/\partial x$ but, in the case of a magnetic field depending on time t, gives the correction $\int_{x^*}^{x}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\partial\mathbf{A}_0/\partial t\rangle\,dx$ to the effective potential. Next, because the function Ψ is a spinor and $\mathcal{H}_0$ is a scalar operator, the true multiplicity of degeneration of the term determining the reduced equation is equal to $2r$ (the definition of r is given later).

Taking these remarks into account, we present the solution Ψ of Eq. (2.2) in the form

$$\Psi(x,y,t,\mu)=\hat{\chi}^\nu\left[\exp\left(i\int_{x^*}^{x}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{A}_0\rangle dx/\mu\right)\psi^\nu\right],\quad \hat{\chi}^\nu=\chi^\nu(\overset{1}{-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x}},\overset{2}{x},y,t,\mu),\tag{4.37}$$

where the symbol $\chi^\nu(x,p,y,t,\mu)=\chi_0^\nu(x,p,y,t,\mu)+\mu\chi_1^\nu(x,p,y,t,\mu)+\dots$ of the (pseudo)differential operator $\hat{\chi}^\nu(x,p,y,t,\mu)$ is a matrix function consisting of $2r$ columns and 2 rows and ψ is a vector function with $2r$ (interacting) components $\psi^{\nu j}$ satisfying Eq. (3.7). As was mentioned above, to construct the leading term of the asymptotic solution to this equation, we need only to have its *essential part* $L_0^\nu(p,x)+\mu L_1^\nu(p,x)+\mu^2\mathcal{G}(x)$.

Equation (3.12) can be reduced to the equation

$$\left(-\frac{\Delta_y}{2}+v_{\mathrm{int}}(x,y)\right)w^\nu=\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(x)w^\nu\tag{4.38}$$

by the substitutions $\chi_0^\nu=\exp(i\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{A}_0\rangle)w^\nu$ and

$$H_{\mathrm{eff}}^\nu=\frac{p^2}{2}+v_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x),t)+\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(x)+\int_0^x\left\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R}(x'),\frac{\partial\mathbf{A}_0}{\partial t}(x',t)\right\rangle dx'.\tag{4.39}$$

Here ν is just the number of the (classical) effective Hamiltonian (or the adiabatic term) which is also called the number of a *subband of dimensional quantization.* The eigenvalue $\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(x)$ is the energy of the ν-th transverse mode at a point x. In contrast to the case of nanofilms, the eigenvalues $\varepsilon_\perp^\nu$ (and hence the effective Hamiltonians) can be degenerate. The number r, which appeared above, is precisely their multiplicity. Generally speaking, r can depend on x, and in this case the effect called "the intersection of terms or effective Hamiltonians" can occur [77, 78, 79, 80]. Here *we assume that r is independent of x.* Finally, we have

$$\chi_0^\nu=\exp(i\langle\mathbf{y},\mathbf{A}_0\rangle)\|w_1^\nu,\dots,w_r^\nu\|\otimes E_s,\tag{4.40}$$

$$\|w_1^\nu,\dots,w_r^\nu\|\otimes E_s=\left\|\begin{matrix}w_1^\nu(x,y) & 0 & \cdots & w_r^\nu(x,y) & 0\\ 0 & w_1^\nu(x,y) & \cdots & 0 & w_r^\nu(x,y)\end{matrix}\right\|,$$

where $\otimes$ is the tensor product of matrices and E_s is the unit 2×2 matrix. The matrix function χ_1^ν can be found from Eq. (3.14).

Now we discuss the choice of the model potential. We will consider a tube with soft walls and with the same elliptic cross-section [81], which can be modeled by using the potential

$$v_{\mathrm{int}}(x,y)=v_{\mathrm{int}}\left(x^*,\frac{\mathbf{\Phi}(x)^{-1}\mathbf{y}}{D(x)}\right),\qquad v_{\mathrm{int}}(x^*,y)=\left[\left(\frac{y_1}{a}\right)^2+\left(\frac{y_2}{b}\right)^2\right]^m,\quad m>0.\tag{4.41}$$

Passing from the variables $y=(y_1,y_2)$ to the new variables $y'=(y_1',y_2')$ determined by the relation $y=D^\gamma y'$, $\gamma=m/(m+1)$, we obtain $\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(x)=D(x)^{-2\gamma}\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(0)$. It is easy to see that the dispersion $d(x)$ with respect to the coordinates y in the state w_n^ν depends on x according to the relation $d(x) = D(x)^{-\gamma}d(0)$. It is natural to assume that $d(x)$ is *proportional* to the linear dimensions of the tube section. Then D^γ is the "soft" coefficient of extension of the section, and γ is the stiffness coefficient of the walls. The dependence of the energy on x can be represented as

$$\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(x) = \varepsilon_\perp^\nu(0)\frac{d(0)^2}{d(x)^2}. \tag{4.42}$$

As $m \to \infty$, the potential (4.41) disappears in the interior of the domain and tends to ∞ outside this domain; the coefficient $\gamma \to 1$ and $d(x) \to D(x)^{-1}d(0)$. In the limit, we obtain the "empty cylinder" model: $v_{\text{int}}(x^*, y) = 0$ for $(y_1/a)^2 + (y_2/b)^2 \leq 1$ and $v_{\text{int}}(x^*, y) = \infty$ for $(y_1/a)^2 + (y_2/b)^2 > 1$, where $D(x)$ is the coefficient of extension (of homothety). As in the case of nanofilms, we introduce additional "rigid" walls in the area where the wave function is exponentially small.

Taking into account the form of potential (4.41), we obtain the relation

$$w_j^\nu(x, y) = \frac{1}{D(x)}w_j^\nu\left(x^*, \frac{\mathbf{\Phi}(x)^{-1}\mathbf{y}}{D(x)}\right), \qquad j = 1, \dots, r. \tag{4.43}$$

Remark. Calculating χ_0^ν, we do not fix any special form of the functions $w_1^\nu, \dots, w_r^\nu$. We assume that they *form an orthonormal basis in the eigenspace of problem (4.38) corresponding to the eigenvalue (term) $\varepsilon_\perp^\nu(x)$ with the number ν* and depend smoothly on all its variables. Of course, such a basis is not unique, and it is convenient to make its final choice in the subsequent construction of asymptotic solutions. For example, sometimes, w_j^ν can be taken to be the eigenfunctions of the momentum operator $\hat{l}$, i.e., in this case, it is necessary to distinguish the states inside the term according to the projections of the orbital momentum in these states on the tube axis. Then the momentum matrix Λ is diagonal. Of course, it is also possible to change the basis in the space of spinors; this is convenient for the case in which the spin affects the classical dynamics (see below the "medium-wave regime"). Obviously, the choice of a new basis is equivalent to the inclusion of some unitary $2r \times 2r$ matrix depending on x into formula (4.37) after the operator $\hat{\chi}^\nu$.

Effective Hamiltonians of longitudinal motion. Using formulas from §3, we obtain L_0^ν and L_1^ν. In general, the objects Λ, L_y, etc. introduced below also depend on the number ν (as well as χ_j, L_j^ν, and ψ^ν). Sometimes, we omit this dependence to simplify the notation.

The symbols L_0^ν and L_1^ν are determined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&L_0^\nu(p, x) = H_{\text{eff}}\ E_r \otimes E_s,\\
&L_1^\nu(p, x) = ik/2\langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{A}_0\rangle E_r \otimes E_s + L_y \otimes E_s + E_r \otimes L_s + L_{sy}, \quad L_s = -\tfrac{1}{2}\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{H}\rangle,\\
&L_y(p, x) = \Big((\partial_x\Phi)p - 1/2\langle \partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{H}\rangle\Big)\Lambda - \langle \mathbf{Y}_\perp, \mathbf{H}\rangle p + \Big\langle \mathbf{Y}, \nabla v_{\text{ext}} + \tfrac{\partial \mathbf{A}_0}{\partial t} + kp^2\mathbf{n}\Big\rangle,\\
&L_{sy}(p, x) = \mu^{-1}\alpha\Big(M^0 \otimes \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \partial_x\mathbf{R}\rangle + M^1 \otimes \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{n}_1\rangle + M^2 \otimes \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{n}_2\rangle\Big).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

By E_r we denote the unit $r \times r$ matrix, by $\Lambda(x)$ we denote the $r \times r$ momentum matrix with elements $\Lambda_{jj'} = \left\langle w_j^\nu, \hat{l}w_{j'}^\nu\right\rangle_y$, by $M^j(x)$ we denote the $r \times r$ matrix of the from $(M^0)_{jj'} = -i\left\langle w_j^\nu, \big((\partial_1 v_{\text{int}})\partial_2 - (\partial_2 v_{\text{int}})\partial_1\big)w_{j'}^\nu\right\rangle_y$, $(M^1)_{jj'} = \left\langle w_j^\nu, (\partial_2 v_{\text{int}})w_{j'}^\nu\right\rangle_y p$, $(M^2)_{jj'} = -\left\langle w_j^\nu, (\partial_1 v_{\text{int}})w_{j'}^\nu\right\rangle_y p$, where $\partial_i = \partial/\partial y_i$, and by $\mathbf{Y}(x) = Y_1\mathbf{n}_1 + Y_2\mathbf{n}_2$, $\mathbf{Y}_\perp(x) = Y_2\mathbf{n}_1 - Y_1\mathbf{n}_2$ we denote the three-dimensional "vectors" whose components are the 2×2 "dipole" matrices $(Y_i)_{jj'}(x) = \left\langle w_j^\nu, y_i w_{j'}^\nu\right\rangle_y$, $i = 1, 2$. As above, $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_y$ denotes the integration over the variables y. The symbol $L_2^\nu(p,x)$ is significantly more complicated, but we need only a part of it, i.e., the so-called "geometric potential" $\mathcal{G}(x) = -(k^2(x)/8)E_r \otimes E_s$. In the long-wave approximation, it is necessary to take this term into account. Precisely this term generates bound states in an empty waveguide [55].

Additional boundary and initial conditions. Formulas (4.44) allow one to construct the leading term of different asymptotic solutions to the effective equation of adiabatic (longitudinal) motion of νth subband of dimensional quantization. To perform more complete constructions, one has to sum solutions with different numbers ν. But from the physical viewpoint, one is interested in the *reduced equations with only small numbers* ν, and it usually suffices to consider the case of several ν. (In nanotubes, ν, as a rule, does not exceed 7 [64]). This fact turns out to be very important later in the study of equations in curved waveguides and tubes and allows one to ignore the applicability problem for the asymptotic formulas obtained for large ν, and the convergence problem for the corresponding series with respect to the number ν. For this reason, *it suffices to pose the additional boundary and initial conditions already not for the original equation, but for finite (here one-dimensional)* (*simplified*) *equations of the form* (3.7). Using the physical terminology, we can say that it is of interest to study the longitudinal dynamics of a small set of subregions of transverse quantization. The corresponding additional conditions for the case of spatial waveguides will be posed accurately below.

5 Asymptotic solutions to the effective equations of adiabatic motion

Now we want to discuss the question about solutions to the reduced effective equations of adiabatic motion. The existence of the *adiabatic* parameter μ allows one to separate the *fast motion* from the *adiabatic motion* (the electron motion from the nuclei motion in a molecule, the transverse motion from the longitudinal motion in waveguide, electron waves from the lattice oscillations in crystals, etc.). A very important fact is that the parameter μ slightly depends on the energy of adiabatic motion in a certain range where it varies. The fact that the adiabatic approximation holds for the entire region of energies of adiabatic motion is well known in physical literature (see, e.g., [82]). The adiabatic motion can be essentially different for different energies from this region. This fact is important if one is interested in the construction of asymptotic or exact solutions to the reduced equation of adiabatic motion describing different physical processes (and corresponding to different energies). This means that asymptotic and sometimes exact solutions are of different type and thus the process of determining the leading (or essential) part of the symbol L should be revised. For instance, some parts of the correction L_1 must be moved to the leading part of L. As we also mentioned, this fact can, in turn, change the definition of the characteristics of the reduced equation and, in particular, lead to the "semiclassical splitting" of terms in the degenerate case (when $r \neq 1$). In the case of nanotubes, this effect shows how the spin affects the determination of classical characteristics. We think that the best way to explain these phenomena is to consider a simple nontrivial example which, in our opinion, is the problem of quantum waves in nanotubes. Thus, we restrict ourselves to this example bearing in mind its importance. Moreover, it seems advisable to explain the main ideas and considerations with the example of the Schrödinger equation with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\mathcal{H}} = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\Delta_x - \frac{1}{2}\Delta_y + v(x,y), \tag{5.1}$$

where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^k$. This is done in §5.1. If one chooses an appropriate potential $v(x, y)$, this equation describes problems of molecular physics, as well as of quantum waveguides. The ideas from §5.1 are applied to the problem of quantum waves in nanotubes in §5.2.

As we mentioned above, the semiclassical analysis of the reduced effective equation for adiabatic motion is well developed and the solutions for the above-listed problems are given in the simplest form by using the Maslov canonical operator [6, 83]. To obtain explicit formulas is a problem which must be solved in concrete situations. There are many publications devoted to the Maslov canonical operator. Here we only note that this is actually a certain algorithm whose realization, as well as the process of obtaining an answer appropriate from the viewpoint of the use in applied problems (e.g., the plots of solutions, the calculation of the scattering data, the frequency of beating, etc.), even in the one-dimensional situation, requires additional efforts and the use of computers. A detailed description of the solutions based on this algorithm and concrete physical results are not the goal of this work. These results present the contents of other publications (see, e.g., [84, 85]). Here, in §5.3, we only very briefly describe the asymptotic solutions and the simplest physical results. This remark also concerns all the examples considered in this paper.

The majority of the ideas stated below in §5.1 can be generalized to other examples discussed above. Nevertheless, it is necessary to emphasize that a "simple" Hamiltonian of the form (5.1) has a very special form, and hence some effects related to this Hamiltonian do not occur in the examples with other Hamiltonians. On the other hand, if the Hamiltonian has a different form, then other interesting effects can appear.

5.1 General considerations.

Internal and external parameters. In the examples under study, we implicitly assume that the dimensionless coefficients (e.g., the potential v_{ext} in nanofilms and nanotubes) is independent of μ. Indeed, in real situations, it is sometimes natural to assume that the coefficients can depend on both μ and other parameters. These parameters characterize the kinetic energy of adiabatic motion, the strength of external fields, the strength of interactions, etc. In this case, the functions χ_0^ν, χ_1^ν, ..., L_0^ν, L_1^ν, ... in formula (3.9) also depend on these parameters. Nevertheless, under appropriate constraints, the formula of separation of variables (3.9) remains valid. For purposes of mathematical rigor, some constraints must be imposed on these parameters of the problem so as to connect them, for example, with the parameter μ. However, in this case, one must bear in mind that, in concrete situations, all these parameters are numbers, and such constraint formulas are of a very conventional character. For this reason, to avoid cumbersome notation, we present the explicit dependence on such parameters only if it is necessary.

Semiclassical parameter h. The fact that the solutions of the equation of adiabatic motion can be essentially different originates from the existence of an additional parameter, which characterizes the excitations of the adiabatic subsystem in the allowable range. To introduce this parameter, we consider the first well-known asymptotics of Eq. (2.5) corresponding to different energies in the case of the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathcal{H}}_0 = \frac{1}{2}(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^2 + \frac{1}{2}(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y})^2 + v(x, y)$. Denote, for a moment, by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the inner product in the original configuration space. The kinetic energies of fast and adiabatic motions in this situation are $\mathbf{K_f} = \langle \Psi, \frac{1}{2}(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial y})^2\Psi \rangle$ and $\mathbf{K_a} = \langle \Psi, \frac{1}{2}(-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x})^2\Psi \rangle$, respectively.

As we mentioned above, according to [6], the semiclassical solutions to Eq.(3.7) have the WKB-form $\Psi \approx \chi(\partial S/\partial x, x, y)\psi(x, t, \mu)$, $\psi \approx \exp(iS(x, t)/\mu)\varphi(x, t, \mu)$, where the function $\varphi(x, t, \mu)$ depends regularly on μ. In this case, the kinetic energies of fast and adiabatic motions have the *same order*: $\mathbf{K_f} \sim \mathbf{K_a} \sim 1$. This solution corresponds to the *excited state* of adiabatic motion. On the other side, Born and Oppenheimer [1, 3] constructed the harmonic oscillator type solution $\Psi \approx \chi(x, y, \mu)\psi(x, \mu)$, $\psi \approx \exp(-x^2/\mu)$. This solution corresponds to the kinetic energy $\mathbf{K}_a \sim \mu$, hence the energy of adiabatic (nuclei) motion in this case is much smaller than the energy of fast motion. Further, in the theory of waveguides, we sometimes have solutions of the form $\Psi \approx \chi(y, x, \mu)\psi(x, t, \mu)$, where $\chi(y, x, \mu)$, $\psi(x, t, \mu)$ depend regularly on μ. For these solutions, we obtain $\mathbf{K_a} \sim \mu^2$. The above-listed different asymptotics can be classified by the parameter $h = \mu\sqrt{\mathbf{K_f}/\mathbf{K_a}} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{K_a}/\mathbf{K_f} \sim \mu^2/h^2$. We call h the *semiclassical* parameter. Let us emphasize that the adiabatic parameter is always assumed to be small and, conversely, the parameter h can be small but can also be ~ 1.

This parameter can be explained in another way. For clarity, we consider the plain quantum straight waveguide and, for a while, return back to dimensional variables. We have the diameter d_0 and the length l_0 of the waveguide. Recall that our goal is to construct asymptotic solutions of the reduced equation which describe the motion along the tube axis in a sufficiently wide range of longitudinal energies and the transverse wavelength $\lambda_\perp \sim d_0$. To the longitudinal energy, there corresponds the characteristic de Broglie wavelength $\lambda_\parallel = \hbar/p_\parallel$, where $p_\parallel$ is the dimensional momentum of longitudinal motion. Now the *"semiclassical"* parameter is $h = \lambda_\parallel/l_0$. In other words, the parameter h determines the "smoothness" of the function ψ (h^{-1} is the number of oscillations at the distance $\sim l_0$) and agrees with the estimation of its derivatives: $\langle \psi, \frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x}\rangle \sim h^{-1}$.

We again consider the example of an empty waveguide. Then the energy of the longitudinal motion on the ν-th subband of transversal quantization has the form: $p_\parallel^2/2m + v_{\text{eff}}(x)$, where $v_{\text{eff}}(x) = v_{\text{ext}}(x) + \nu^2\pi^2\varepsilon_\perp$, $\varepsilon_\perp = \hbar^2/(2md_0^2)$. Denote by $p_\perp$ the transverse momentum. Taking into account the relation between the de Broglie wavelength and the corresponding momentum, we obtain $\frac{p_\parallel}{p_\perp} \sim \frac{\hbar/\lambda_\parallel}{\hbar/\lambda_\perp} \sim \frac{d/l_0}{\lambda_\parallel/l_0} \sim \frac{\mu}{h}$. Thus, the kinetic energies of longitudinal (adiabatic) and transverse (fast) motions satisfy the relations $\mathbf{K_a}/\mathbf{K_f} \sim \mu^2/h^2$ and $\mathbf{K_f} \sim \varepsilon_\perp$. Now we return to dimensionless variables. Then the dimensionless longitudinal kinetic energy is $\mathbf{K_a} = p_\parallel^2/2 \sim \mu^2/h^2$. It is clear that if a particle moves along the waveguide, then the kinetic energy can vary under the action of the force $f = -\partial v_{\text{eff}}/\partial x$. For this force f not to accelerate the particle so that its kinetic energy be of order different from μ^2/h^2, it is necessary that its work does not exceed, in the order of magnitude, the parameter of the characteristic kinetic energy corresponding to the initial momentum. In dimensionless variables, to the distance $\sim l_0$ there corresponds an interval ~ 1. Hence the work of the force f is of the order of the derivative $\partial v_{\text{eff}}/\partial x$. This implies that the effective potential must have the form $v_{\text{eff}} = v_{\text{eff}}^0 + \frac{\mu^2}{h^2}v_{\text{eff}}^1(x)$, where $v_{\text{eff}}^0 = \text{const}$ and $v_{\text{eff}}^1(x)$ can, in general, regularly depend on the parameters μ and h. Moreover, the work can be even equal to zero, since the characteristic longitudinal momentum is determined not only by the variable part $v_{\text{eff}}^1(x)$ of the effective potential, but also by the "input" momentum of the wave packet under study (i.e., by the gradient of the phase of the wave function at the initial time instant in the Cauchy problem or by the momentum of the incident wave in the scattering problem). In the last case, the asymptotics of the wave function can be obtained by using the well-known Born approximation.

Remark. We point out that v_{eff} is determined by both the external field and the field of the crystal. Therefore in the case of a quantum waveguide, the above constraints lead, in particular, to the assumption that the geometric parameters of the waveguide, i.e., the curvature (and torsion) of its axis, the width, etc., vary sufficiently "slowly."

Characteristic time scale and the reduced equation consistent with this scale. The question concerning the time scaling is nontrivial and, generally speaking, can be solved separately in each concrete problem. It is natural to understand what characterisitc time is required for a quantum particle to walk through a certain characteristic distance. For problems in nanotubes, the characteristic distance is the total tube length (e.g., in the scattering problem or in the problem of the wavetrain propagation) or the size of the "localization area" of the wave function in the problem of bound states. For a while, we assumee the characteristic distance to be of the order of l_0 in dimensional variables or to be ~ 1 in dimensionless variables. One has to replace the time scaling by the energy scaling in the case of stationary problems (for instance, in problems of electron-phonon interaction or in molecular physics).

Remark. To introduce the characteristic time scale in the general case, we can use the following ideas. It is clear that the characteristic time scale is $t \sim a/\langle v\rangle$, where a is the characteristic distance for adiabatic motion and $\langle v\rangle$ is the mean velocity. Generally speaking, a as well as $\langle v\rangle$ depend on the "longitudinal" kinetic energy. In quantum mechanics, we have $\langle v\rangle = d\langle x\rangle/dt$. Using Eq.(2.2), we obtain $d\langle x\rangle/dt \sim i\mu^{-1}\langle[\hat{p}^2/2, x]\rangle = \langle\hat{p}\rangle = \mu/h$ (cf. Remark 3 in the §3.3). Thus we have $t \sim (h/\mu)a$. For the scattering problem, the wavetrain propagation problem and some other problems, we can set $a \sim 1$. For lower bound states and trapped modes we have to set $a \sim h \sim \sqrt{\langle(\Delta x)^2\rangle}$.

The dimensionless time t used in the general scheme for Eq.(2.2) was actually chosen for the case $p_\perp \sim p_\|$, i.e., for the case $\mu/h \sim 1$. If this relation does not hold, then the time of passage of a particle through the waveguide, which is naturally understood as the characteristic time of the problem, must be multiplied by the factor (h/μ). Therefore, instead of t, it is convenient to introduce a new dimensionless time t' by the relation $t = (h/\mu)t'$.

In the case of nanotubes this redefining of the time scale becomes consistent with the preceding physical argument because of the following transformations in Eq. (3.7). The term v^0_{eff} results only in a displacement (renormalization) of the energy in the stationary problem generated by the reduced equation; or the factor $\exp(-iv^0_{\text{eff}}t'/\mu)$ appears in the wave function ψ^ν of the nonstationary Schrödinger equation (3.7). Taking this into account, we represent the solution of this equation in the form $\psi^\nu = \exp(-iv^0_{\text{eff}}t'/\mu)\psi'^\nu$, where $\psi'^\nu(x,t)$ is a new unknown function. Since we assume that $p \sim \mu/h$, it is natural to divide the equation by the parameter μ^2/h^2. In the left-hand side this gives the derivatives $i(h^2/\mu)\frac{\partial\psi'^\nu}{\partial t'}$, which, after the above change of time, take the form $ih\frac{\partial\psi'^\nu}{\partial t'}$. It is important to point out that this transformation concerns only the time variable: the variables x and y are not transformed. As a result, instead of Eq. (3.7) and Eq. (4.44) taking the corrections L^ν_1, L^ν_2, etc., into account, we obtain the equation (the primes are omitted):

$$ih\frac{\partial\psi^\nu}{\partial t} = \left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(-ih\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^2 + v^1_{\text{eff}} + \frac{h^2}{\mu}\Big[L^\nu_1\Big(\frac{\mu}{h}\overset{1}{(-ih\frac{\partial}{\partial x})}, \overset{2}{x}\Big) + \mu L^\nu_2\Big(\frac{\mu}{h}\overset{1}{(-ih\frac{\partial}{\partial x})}, \overset{2}{x}\Big) + \dots\Big]\right\}\psi^\nu \tag{5.2}$$

Accuracy of asymptotic expansions. The number of terms in the expansion of the intertwining operator $\hat{\chi}$ and the operator $\hat{L}$ can be arbitrarily large. However, as we already mentioned, to calculate terms of these series explicitly, even terms with small numbers, is, as a rule, a very complicated problem. Therefore, it is natural to consider only the terms for which one can correctly estimate the *leading term* of the asymptotics of the wave function or of the energy value. It is reasonable that the notion of the "leading" term of an asymptotics can be determined not only by the adiabatic parameter μ, but also by the "semiclassical parameter" h, which is related to the form of the coefficients and the solution of the effective equation of adiabatic motion. We shall turn back to the question about numbers of terms in the intertwining operator $\hat{\chi}$ and the operator $\hat{L}$ later. Now we recall well known estimates which allow us to estimate these numbers.

Taking in account this fact, let us discuss the problem of choosing the number of terms in the expansion of the symbols of the operator $\hat{L}$ and the intertwining operator $\hat{\chi}$. Again we restrict our consideration to the case of nanotubes, although the main ideas can be generalized for the majority of the adiabatic problems listed above, including the non-self-adjoint problems like water waves in a picnocline (problems of such type usually appear in hydrodynamics).

Since the problem contains two parameters μ and h, we shall calculate as many terms as we need to construct the leading term of the asymptotics with respect to $\max(h,\mu)$ if $h \ll 1$ and with respect to μ if $h = 1$. (Recall that the parameter μ is always assumed to be small, and the parameter h can be either small or of order $O(1)$.) To find the minimal reasonable number of terms in asymptotic expansions, it is natural to use the well-known estimate for the solution of the Cauchy problem for a nonhomogeneous Schrödinger type equation: $i\varepsilon\frac{\partial\phi}{\partial t} = \hat{A}\phi + f$, $\phi|_{t=0} = 0$. Here $\hat{A}(t)$ is an essentially self-adjoint (for each t) operator in L_2, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let ϕ be a solution of this problem; then the following inequality holds for any t from the fixed interval $[0,T]$: $\|\phi\|_{L_2} \le \frac{T}{\varepsilon}\max_{t\in[0,T]}\|f\|_{L_2}$.

We assume that ψ_{ex} is an exact solution of the original equation (3.7) and Ψ_{as} is its asymptotic solution of the form (3.9) and these solutions coincide at zero instant; moreover, ψ_{as} satisfies the original equation with discrepancy f_{as}. For the operator $\hat{A}$, we choose the original quantum Hamiltonian and set $\varepsilon = \mu$ and $T = \frac{h}{\mu}T_0$, where T_0 is independent of h and μ. Then we obtain the estimate

$$\|\psi_{\text{as}} - \psi_{\text{ex}}\| \le \frac{h}{\mu^2}T_0 \max\|f_{\text{as}}\|_{L_2} \tag{5.3}$$

for the difference $\phi = \psi_{\text{as}} - \psi_{\text{ex}}$. This implies that the minimal reasonable number of terms in the expansion of the symbols of the operators $\hat{\chi}$ and $\hat{L}$ in formulas (3.6) and (3.8) must at least satisfy the condition $\frac{h}{\mu^2}\|f_{\text{as}}\|_{L_2} \ll 1$ for $\mu \ll 1$. Of course, it should be remembered that the norm of the discrepancy f_{as} depends on μ and h. As heuristic arguments, it is also useful to apply the estimate (5.3) to the reduced equation (3.7).

Classification of quantum states for longitudinal motion We return to the passage from Eq. (3.7) to Eq. (5.2). For $h \ll 1$, to construct a wave function, it is natural to use the semiclassical approximation. Outside a neighborhood of the focal points (the turning points), the typical asymptotics of a wave function with characteristic wavelength $\lambda_{\|} \sim h$ is given by the WKB-solution

$$\psi(x,t) = A(x,t,h)\exp\left(\frac{iS(x,t)}{h}\right), \quad A(x,t,h) = A(x,t,0) + O(h), \tag{5.4}$$

where $S(x,t)$ is the phase and $A(x,t,h)$ is, in general, the vector amplitude. As it is known [6], in the first approximation, after the substitution of this function into the original equation, the operator $-ih\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ is, in the leading part, replaced by $\frac{\partial S}{\partial x}$, and thus the order of the terms in the operators $h^2\mu^{j-2}L_j^{\nu}(\overset{2}{x}, \frac{\mu}{h}\overset{1}{(-ih\frac{\partial}{\partial x})})$ in (5.2) is determined by the order of the functions $L_j^{\nu}(x, \frac{\mu}{h}\frac{\partial S}{\partial x})$. This fact leads to the well-known conclusion that the phase $S(x,t)$ is determined by the classical Hamiltonian system whose Hamiltonian is the leading part of the symbol expansion with respect to the parameter h. Bearing this in mind, it is natural to define the operator $\hat{p^h} = -ih\partial/\partial x$, rather than the operator $\hat{p} = -i\mu\partial/\partial x$, to be the momentum operator. Clearly, for $\mu = h$, the classical Hamiltonian is the effective Hamiltonian (3.13), but if the adiabatic and semiclassical parameters μ and h are of different orders and $h \ll 1$, then to construct semiclassical asymptotic it is required to write the expansion with respect to parameter h, assigning $\mu = \mu(h)$. As we shall see later, in some cases, additional terms from L_1^ν will be included in the classical Hamiltonian (subject to the expansion with respect to h).

Now let us discuss how many terms in the expansion of the operator in the right-hand side of (5.2) we must have to find the leading part of its asymptotic solution. By setting $\varepsilon = h$ and applying the estimate (5.3) to Eq. (5.2), we see that, at least intuitively, it suffices to calculate the effective Hamiltonian $(p^h)^2/2 + v_{\text{eff}}^1$ and the first correction $L_1^\nu(x, \frac{\mu}{h}p^h)$. This conclusion is consistent with the well-known fact from the theory of semiclassical asymptotics: terms of the order of h^2 (and even of $h^{1+\delta}$, $\delta > 0$) do not affect the phase $S(x,t)$ and the leading part of the amplitude $A(x,t,0)$. This conclusion has a general character and holds always if it is assumed that $\mu \leq h \ll 1$, i.e., for the case in which the semiclassical approximation can be used. At the same time, as we just noted, concrete formulas can essentially differ in the following situations: **a)** if μ and h have the same order ($\mu \sim h$) and **b)** if $\mu \ll h$. If the parameter $h \sim 1$, then the semiclassical approximation cannot be used, but Eq. (5.2) remains to hold and can even be simplified, although in this case a part of L_2^ν must be taken into account. The existence of these differences results in the following classification of asymptotic solutions depending on the relation between the parameters μ and h (or, which is equivalent, depending on the relation between the longitudinal $\mathbf{K}_a$ and transverse $\mathbf{K}_f$ kinetic energies in the waveguide).

a) For $h = \mu$, we have the standard "semiclassical" situation [6] or the *"short-wave" regime* in which the "longitudinal" energy is of the same order as the energy of transverse motion and $d \sim \lambda_\| \ll l_0$ in dimensional variables. Then the effective adiabatic and semiclassical Hamiltonians, as well as the corrections to them, coincide, and to find the leading term of the asymptotics of the wave function, the complete description of the effective Hamiltonian and the first correction is required.

b) In this case, which is naturally called the *"medium-wave" regime*, $\mu \ll h \ll 1$, the "longitudinal" energy of the mode is significantly less than that of the "transverse" mode and $d < \lambda_\| \leq \sqrt{l_0 d}$ in dimensional variables. Then, expanding the correction L_1^ν with respect to the parameter μ/h, for the symbol of the operator, we obtain

$$L^\nu = \left(\frac{(p^h)^2}{2} + v_{\text{eff}}^1 + \frac{h^2}{\mu}L_1^\nu(x,0)\right) + h\frac{\partial L_1^\nu}{\partial p}(x,0)p^h + h \cdot O(\frac{\mu}{h}).$$

This implies that the nondifferential part $\frac{h^2}{\mu}L_1^\nu(x,0)$ of the first adiabatic correction in the expansion of the operator $\hat{L}_1^\nu$ can be transferred into the semiclassical effective Hamiltonian. This is clearly seen in the case $h = \sqrt{\mu}$. Then the semiclassical effective Hamiltonian becomes equal to $\frac{(p^h)^2}{2} + v_{\text{eff}}^1 + L_1^\nu(x,0)$. Moreover, for $h^2 \gg \mu$, the term $\frac{h^2}{\mu}L_1^\nu(x,0)$ can play the determining role. Then an argument similar to that in item 2.6 shows that this term "accelerates" the particle in the longitudinal direction so that the characteristic longitudinal momentum in dimensionless variables takes the value $\sqrt{\mu}$. In other words, in this case, for the parameter h we must take the parameter $\sqrt{\mu}$, and we return to the situation considered above, but with v_{eff}^1 multiplied by a small value. Clearly, if $L_1^\nu(x,0) = 0$, then the above argument is meaningless. But, as we shall see later, such a term appears in nanotubes both due to their geometry and due to the external electromagnetic field. In this case, there arise some additional parameters, e.g., field amplitudes, and these parameters can effectively decrease the value of $L_1^\nu(x,0)$ and thus compensate the increase caused by the parameter h^2/μ. We also note that the terms in the operator $\hat{L}_1^\nu$ containing the second- and higher-order derivatives (corresponding to higher powers in the expansion of L_1^ν with respect to the variable p^h) can be omitted in the calculations of the leading term of the semiclassical asymptotic solution, although, of course, these terms do not decrease the accuracy.

Remark. If the main part of the Hamiltonian is quadratic with respect to the momenta, the Hamiltonian preserves its form. In the other examples considered above (e.g., for equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients, for waves in picnocline), the leading part of the adiabatic Hamiltonian L_0 depends on the momentum p. Therefore, this expansion changes the structure of the leading part. For example, in the problem with rapidly oscillating coefficients (electron waves in crystals), L_0 is replaced by its expansion with respect to p in a more complex way (non quadratically). Moreover, this expansion, as a rule, begins with terms quadratic with respect to p. The coefficient before p^2 is inversely proportional to the *effective mass* (see [4]).

c) If the parameter $h \sim 1$, then the semiclassical approximation cannot be used, and the wave functions oscillate, if at all, rather slowly and in the dimensional variables $\lambda_{\|} \sim l_0$. According to the above, this situation is possible only if $L_1^\nu(x,0) \equiv 0$. But the adiabatic approximation works, and from (5.2) one can easily derive the equation for the leading term of the asymptotics of the (smooth) wave function $\psi(x,t)$ on the waveguide axis. For this, it suffices to set $h = 1$ in (5.2) and then to let $\mu \to 0$. As the result of this passage to the limit, which is naturally called the *long-wave approximation*, we obtain the equation

$$i\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial t} = \left[\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + v_{\text{eff}}^1 - i\frac{\partial L_1^\nu}{\partial p}(x,0)\frac{\partial}{\partial x} + L_2^\nu(x,0)\right]\psi.$$

Remark. As already noted for the Helmholtz operator in plane one-mode waveguides, such an equation was first obtained in [55], where, in particular, it was proved that one can organize a single bound state in the waveguide by choosing an appropriate curvature of the waveguide. An equation similar to (5.11) and several consequences of it were obtained in [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 57, 58]. We also note that the equations of this type are close to the equations obtained as the result of averaging or homogenization on the theory of wave process in the media with rapidly varying characteristics [40, 86, 87, 88].

d) Finally, we can consider the case in which $\mu \gg h$ or, in dimensional variables, $\lambda_{\|} \ll \lambda_{\perp} \ll l_0$. This case is naturally called the "ultrashort-wave" regime. For Eq. (5.2) to be meaningful, it is necessary to impose additional constraints on the behavior of the functions L_j^ν in the variable p. We consider only the case for which L_j^ν are polynomials of a degree not exceeding 2 with respect to p. Then it is easy to show that the semiclassical approximation for any $\mu \gg h$ can be applied to Eq. (5.2). However, this is not sufficient for reconstructing the asymptotic solution of the original Schrödinger equation in the waveguide from the function $\psi(x,t)$ by formula (3.9). For example, if the first correction χ_1^ν in the expansion of the symbol of the intertwining operator $\hat{\chi}^\nu$ in formula (3.6) depends linearly on p, $\mu \geq h^2$, and a rapidly oscillating function of the form (5.4) is taken to be ψ, then the function $\mu\hat{\chi}_1\psi$ turns out to be not small. In this sense, the expansion of the operator $\hat{\chi}$ in powers of μ is not an asymptotic expansion. For this reason, as we shall see below, the ultrashort-wave approximation for curved nanotubes can be used for the case in which $h^2 \ll \mu \ll h$. We can also note that, in the ultrashort-wave case, the actual effective potential v_{eff}^1 is small so that it can be transferred into L_1^ν or even omitted at all. Then the semiclassical effective Hamiltonian coincides with the Hamiltonian of a free particle, and hence, in this case, the semiclassics is simply the Born approximation.

Remark. It should be remembered that, in concrete calculations, the above classification (in the parameters μ and h) must be made more precise, which is related to the values of both the external fields and the crystal field, as well as the relations between them. Of course, in this case, the corrections can also be included into the leading part of the symbol (in the classical Hamiltonian), which, however, can unnecessarily complicate the procedure for constructing the asymptotic solutions. On the other hand, as already noted, in a real situation, each parameter is a concrete small number, and hence the further detailing of how the effective Hamiltonian and corrections to it depend on the relation between the parameters μ and h has an academic, rather than practical, character. Taking this consideration into account, it is convenient, from the mathematical viewpoint, to fix the relations between the parameters μ and h, assuming for the respective regimes that **a**) $h=\mu$, **b**) $h=\sqrt{\mu}$, **c**) $h=1$, **d**) $h=\mu^{3/2}$ and including the "remaining" parts of the relations between μ and h into the coefficients of the equation (such as the strengths of electric and magnetic fields, curvature, etc.).

The suggested classification can be used in the general situation. But in some cases some regimes (like ultrashort wave region or long wave region) does not exist. Anyway the question of existence of solutions to a certain fixed h should be solved individually.

The number of terms in the intertwining operator. We assume that we use the dimensionless time t consistent with the semiclassical parameter h (see subsection **Characteristic time scale and the reduced equation consistent with this scale**). Suppose that we have preserved N terms in the expansion of the symbols of the operators $\hat{\chi}^\nu$ and $\hat{L}^\nu$ determined by the coefficients χ^ν_j and L^ν_j. Suppose also that we have constructed a function ψ^ν satisfying the reduced equation (5.2) with accuracy up to a discrepancy f. It follows from the formulas of §3 that, for appropriately defined χ^ν_j and L^ν_j, the substitution of the function $\Psi=\hat{\chi}^\nu\psi^\nu$ into the original equation gives

$$ih\frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial t}-\frac{h^2}{\mu^2}\hat{\mathcal{H}}\Psi=h^2\mu^{N-1}\hat{F}\psi^\nu+\hat{\chi}^\nu f.$$

Here $\hat{F}$ is, in general, a pseudodifferential operator that does not change (as well as the operator $\hat{\chi}^\nu$) the order of the functions ψ^ν with respect to the parameter h if the functions oscillate with the characteristic wavelength not less than h. Applying the estimate (5.3) to this equation, we readily obtain the following conclusion: the function Ψ differs from the exact solution by a value of the order $O(h^\delta)$, $\delta>0$, for $h\ll 1$ or of the order $O(\mu)$ for $h=1$ if $N\geq 1$ and the discrepancy f is equal to $O(h^{\delta+1})$ for $h\ll 1$ or to $O(\mu)$ for $h=1$. Thus, the minimal reasonable number of terms in the expansion of the operator $\hat{\chi}^\nu$ in constructing the semiclassical asymptotics is equal to 2 (i.e., we must consider the zeroth- and first-order terms). But if we are interested in the long-wave approximation (i.e., in the case $h=1$), then, obviously, in the expansion of $\hat{\chi}^\nu$ we must consider three terms of the expansion (i.e., $N=2$). In this case, it suffices to solve the reduced equation (5.2) up to $O(\mu)$.

The problem of calculating the symbols of the operators $\hat{\chi}^\nu$ and $\hat{L}^\nu$ is close to the problems in perturbation theory for operators with discrete spectrum (in particular, matrices), and the function L^ν is similar to an eigenvalue, while χ^ν is similar to an eigenfunction. The terms of the expansion of the symbols χ^ν and L^ν are calculated successively, but the explicit calculation of L^ν_j precedes the calculation of χ^ν_j and is based on the fact that χ^ν_j exists. On the other hand, the leading term of the asymptotics is already determined by χ^ν_0 (and, naturally, by the function ψ^ν). Thus, in the construction of the semiclassical asymptotics in the minimal reasonable approximation, explicit formulas are required only for L^ν_0, L^ν_1 and χ^ν_0, while in the construction of the long-wave asymptotics, explicit formulas are required for L^ν_0, L^ν_1, L^ν_2 and χ^ν_0, χ^ν_1. Moreover, as was already discussed in item 2.9, to obtain the medium-wave and long-wave approximations ($h\gg\mu$), for L^ν_1, it suffices to calculate this function and its first-order derivative for $p=0$, while for L^ν_2, it suffices to calculate this function for $p=0$. This fact is very important for deriving explicit formulas. It should be noted that, although the terms $\mu\hat{\chi}^\nu_1\psi^\nu$ for $h\ll 1$ and $(\mu\hat{\chi}^\nu_1+\mu^2\hat{\chi}^\nu_2)\psi^\nu$ for $h\sim 1$ are only corrections to the leading term $\hat{\chi}_0\psi^\nu$ of the asymptotic expansion, it can be described correctly only if the existence of such corrections is guaranteed, while the discrepancy obtained by the direct substitution of the function $\hat{\chi}_0^\nu \psi^\nu$ into the original equation is not sufficient to prove that the difference between $\hat{\chi}_0^\nu \psi^\nu$ and the exact solution is small. Here we have the following distinction from the standard semiclassical approximation for the scalar Schrödinger equation: in the latter case, the substitution of the leading term of the asymptotics into the original equation readily gives the desired small discrepancy $O(h^2)$.

Essential part of the quantum Hamiltonian for longitudinal motion. Thus, it follows from the analysis performed in the preceding items that, in all cases **a)**–**d)**, the leading term of the asymptotic expansion of ψ^ν (as well as of Ψ) is completely determined (sometimes, with excessive accuracy) by the quantum Hamiltonian

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\nu = \frac{1}{2}\left(-ih\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^2 + v_{\text{eff}}^1 + \frac{h^2}{\mu}\left[L_1^\nu\Big(\overset{2}{x}, \frac{\mu}{h}\big(\overset{1}{-i\mu\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}\big)\Big) + \mu L_2^\nu(x,0)\right].$$

This Hamiltonian is naturally called the *essential part of the Hamiltonian of longitudinal motion on the ν-th subband of size quantization.*

Semiclassical splitting of adiabatic terms. For $h \gg \mu$, the correction $L_1(x,0)$ can change the effective Hamiltonians. This change can be essentially important for the case in which the term is degenerate or (and) the original problem is a vector problem (i.e., the original quantum Hamiltonian is a matrix Hamiltonian). Let us consider this situation in more detail. Because the original problem is self-adjoint, the matrix $L_1(x,0)$ is Hermitian. We assume that all its eigenvalues $\lambda_1(x), \dots, \lambda_r(x)$ are distinct and, along with the eigenvectors, smoothly depend on x. Moreover, to avoid any renormalization of energy, for simplicity, we assume that $\lambda_j(x)$ varies along the waveguide and $\lambda_j = 0$ at the beginning of the waveguide. Since any adiabatic term is degenerate, there is a great ambiguity in the choice of vector functions χ_j^ν, $j = 1, \dots, r$, and any variation in their choice naturally leads to a change of the matrix L_1^ν. We choose the vector functions χ_j^ν, $j = 1, \dots, r$, so that the matrix $L_1^\nu(x,0)$ be diagonal. If $1 \gg h \gg \mu$ (we have the "medium-wave" approximation), then the expressions $\frac{h^2}{\mu}\lambda_j(x)$ must be added to the semiclassical Hamiltonian. Following an argument similar to that in item 2.6, we conclude that the parameter h must satisfy the inequality $\sqrt{\mu} \geq h \gg \mu$. We see that the semiclassical Hamiltonians (terms) $\frac{1}{2}(p^h)^2 + v_{\text{eff}}^1 + \frac{h^2}{\mu}\lambda_j$ become different for different j and thus the "semiclassical" separation of "adiabatic" terms occurs. The value of this splitting depends on the number $\frac{h^2}{\mu}$ and attains its maximum at $h \sim \sqrt{\mu}$. In the first approximation with respect to the parameter $\frac{h^2}{\mu}$, the states corresponding to different semiclassical Hamiltonians do not interact. Thus, inside an adiabatic term, we can asymptotically diagonalize the system for the vector function ψ^ν. Although this asymptotic fact turns out to be valid for any values of h from the above interval, it is clear that, for values of h close to μ, the subsequent terms of the expansion can be large so that the above representation of such an asymptotic "diagonalization" becomes meaningless. Therefore, the situation with h close to μ must be considered as a situation with a degenerate term, and it is more natural to leave the term $\frac{h^2}{\mu}\lambda_j$ in the original correction $\frac{h^2}{\mu}L_1^\nu$, which allows one more adequately to take into account the interaction between the states inside an adiabatic term. This reasoning concerns the case of the matrix correction L_1^ν. In the scalar situation, the term $\frac{h^2}{\mu}L_1^\nu(x,0)$ can always be included into the effective Hamiltonian, but, in general, this does not hold in the vector case. We have no opportunity to discuss the problems touched upon in this section in more detail. We only point out that all phenomena mentioned in this and in the preceding items are completely determined by the essential part of the matrix analog of the Hamiltonian of longitudinal motion on the ν-th subband of size quantization.

5.2 Essential parts of the effective Hamiltonians for longitudinal motions in nanotubes for different regimes.

The goal of this subsection is to realize the ideas from the previous subsection concerning the problem of quantum waves in nanotubes with spin taken into account.

As already noted, the "rapidity" of the longitudinal mode is determined by the parameter h. For $h \ll 1$, the corresponding states (in particular, the levels of longitudinal motion) are described by semiclassical asymptotics. Since the strong electric or magnetic field increases the longitudinal energy of a particle while it passes through the tube, the parameter h cannot be chosen arbitrarily and must be consistent with the strengths of the external fields contained in the problem. For mathematical rigor, we must assume that there is a functional dependence between the parameters μ, h and the strengths of the fields. From the physical viewpoint, it is natural to speak about the value of different terms in (4.44) in dependence on the "rapidity" of the longitudinal mode and the strengths of external fields. For a solution with wavelength $\sim h$ to exist, it is necessary that the work of the effective field $E_{\text{eff}}(x) = -\partial v_{\text{ext}}/\partial x - \partial\varepsilon_\perp(x)/\partial x - \langle\partial_x\mathbf{R}, \partial\mathbf{A}_0/\partial t\rangle$ along the tube do not exceed, in the order of magnitude, the characteristic kinetic energy of the longitudinal motion: $\varepsilon_\parallel \sim \mu^2/h^2$. This implies the following constraints on the external fields and the "oscillation" in the dimensions of the section. We assume that the potential of the external electric field is equal to zero at one of the tube ends; thus, $v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x), t)$ will be equal to the work of the field along the tube. This implies that the external potential in dimensionless variables has the order of μ^2/h^2. We introduce the functions $v^1_{\text{ext}}(x,t)$ and $\lambda^\nu(x)$ determined by the relations $v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x), t) = (\mu^2/h^2)v^1_{\text{ext}}(x,t)$, $\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x) = \varepsilon^\nu_\perp(0) + (\mu^2/h^2)\lambda^\nu(x)$ and we assume that $v^1_{\text{ext}}(x,t)$, $\lambda^\nu(x)$ take values that do not exceed unity with respect to the parameter.

In what follows, for simplicity, we assume that the function v^1_{ext}, in fact, smoothly depends on t', and we write $v^1_{\text{ext}}(x,t')$. The constraint on the effective field implies a constraint on the character of the time-dependence of the magnetic field. We assume that $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{H}_0 + (\mu/h)\mathbf{H}_1(t')$.

We replace the "adiabatic" momentum operator $\hat{p} = -i\mu\partial/\partial x$ by the "dynamic" operator $\hat{p}^h = -ih\partial/\partial x$, obtain $\hat{p} = (\mu/h)\hat{p}^h$, and then divide the adiabatic Hamiltonian by μ^2/h^2 to "compensate" the redefined momentum. This leads to the redefined classical momentum $p = (\mu/h)p^h$ and, by (4.44), to the following formula for the symbol $\mathcal{L}^\nu(p^h, x, t', \mu, h)$ of the *essential part of the quantum effective Hamiltonian* $\hat{\mathcal{L}}^\nu$ *of the longitudinal motion*:

$$\mathcal{L}^\nu = \left[\frac{(p^h)^2}{2} + v^1_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x), t') + \phi(x,t') + \lambda^\nu(x)\right] E_r \otimes E_s +$$
$$+\frac{h^2}{\mu}\left[-E_r \otimes \frac{1}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{H}\rangle\Lambda \otimes E_s + L_{sy}\right] + h\Big[(\partial_x\Phi)\Lambda - \langle\mathbf{Y}_\perp, \mathbf{H}\rangle\Big] \otimes E_s p^h +$$
$$+\mu\left\langle\mathbf{Y}, \nabla v^1_{\text{ext}} + \frac{\partial\mathbf{A}^1_0}{\partial t'} + k(p^h)^2\mathbf{n}\right\rangle - \frac{h^2k(x)^2}{8}\, E_r \otimes E_s, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\mathbf{A}^1_0 = (1/2)[\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{H}_1(t')]$, $\phi(x,t') = (1/2)\int_{x^*}^{x}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R}(x'), [\mathbf{R}(x'), \partial\mathbf{H}_1(t')/\partial t']\rangle\, dx'$. Omitting the primes, we obtain the desired reduced equation on the subregion of dimensional quantization in the form:

$$ih\frac{\partial\psi^\nu}{\partial t} = \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\nu\psi^\nu, \qquad \hat{\mathcal{L}}^\nu = \mathcal{L}^\nu(-ih\overset{1}{\frac{\partial}{\partial x}}, \overset{2}{x}, t, \mu, h). \tag{5.6}$$

Along with formulas (4.37) and (4.40), this equation, for different relations between μ and h, determines the leading term of the asymptotic solutions of the original equation (2.2). Sometimes, several terms in (5.5) can be omitted, and several terms from the "adiabatic" correction (sometimes, matrix terms) can be transferred into the leading part of the "semiclassical" effective Hamiltonian determining, in particular, the dynamics of the classical motion of a particle in a thin tube or, if the terminology introduced in [15, 38] is used, determining the *nonstandard characteristics* of the original equation (2.2). We describe this "transfer" and the corresponding classical systems in the next subsection.

Equations of classical mechanics in nanotubes with spin and the term multiplicity taken into account. Below we perform different expansions of the function (5.5). For $h \ll 1$, we set $\mathcal{L}^\nu = \mathcal{L}_0^\nu + h\mathcal{L}_1^\nu + \ldots$, where $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$ denotes the terms larger than h and $h\mathcal{L}_1^\nu$ denotes the terms $\sim h$. According to [15, 38], these terms allow one to reconstruct the leading term of the semiclassical asymptotics completely for $h \ll 1$, which outside the focal points has the form of WKB-solutions $\psi^\nu \approx \exp(iS^\nu(x,t)/h)A^\nu(x,t)$. Their phases $S^\nu(x,t)$ can be determined by integrating the one-dimensional Hamiltonian system

$$\dot{p}^h = \partial H_{\text{eff}}^h/\partial x, \ \dot{x} = -\partial H_{\text{eff}}^h/\partial p^h \tag{5.7}$$

with the classical Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}^h(p^h, x)$, which is an eigenvalue of the matrix symbol $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$. If the matrix $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$ has distinct eigenvalues, then the *semiclassical splitting of the adiabatic term* occurs, i.e., several distinct classical Hamiltonians H_{eff}^h can correspond to the same adiabatic term H_{eff}. The vector part of the asymptotics ψ^ν can be found from the linear "polarization" equation which contains $\mathcal{L}_1^\nu$.

We shall consider the following situations corresponding to different relations between the parameters μ and h.

a) Short-wave regime: $h = \mu$. Then

$$\begin{gathered}
\mathcal{L}_0^\nu = H_{\text{eff}}^h E_r \otimes E_s, \qquad H_{\text{eff}}^h = \frac{(p^h)^2}{2} + v_{\text{eff}}^h, \quad v_{\text{eff}}^h = v_{\text{ext}}^1(\mathbf{R}(x),t) + \phi(x,t) + \lambda^\nu(x), \\
\mathcal{L}_1^\nu = \left\langle \mathbf{Y}, \nabla v_{\text{ext}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_0^1}{\partial t} + k(p^h)^2\mathbf{n} \right\rangle \otimes E_s + \Big[(\partial_x\Phi)\Lambda - \langle \mathbf{Y}_\perp, \mathbf{H}\rangle\Big] \otimes E_s p^h + \\
+ \left[-E_r \otimes \frac{1}{2}\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{H}\rangle \Lambda \otimes E_s + L_{sy}\right].
\end{gathered} \tag{5.8}$$

The Hamiltonian system in this case is equivalent to the Newton system $\ddot{x} = -\partial v_{\text{eff}}^h/\partial x$. By the estimates in items **2.8, 2.10**, the leading term of the semiclassical asymptotics, which is determined by these classical equations, must give a good approximation in problems with external fields $|\mathbf{H}| \lesssim 1\,\text{T}$, $E_{\text{ext}} = |\nabla v_{\text{ext}}| \lesssim 10^{-3}\,\text{V/nm}$.

b) Medium-wave regime: $h = \mu^{1/2}$. In this case, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_0^\nu = \left[\frac{(p^h)^2}{2} + v_{\text{ext}}^1(\mathbf{R}(x),t) + \phi(x,t) + \lambda^\nu(x)\right] E_r \otimes E_s + W, \tag{5.9}$$

$$W = \left[-E_r \otimes \frac{1}{2}\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{H}\rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle \partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{H}\rangle \Lambda \otimes E_s + L_{sy}\right], \quad \mathcal{L}_1^\nu = \Big((\partial_x\Phi)\Lambda - \langle \mathbf{Y}_\perp, \mathbf{H}\rangle\Big) \otimes E_s p^h.$$

Thus, here the symbol $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$ is a matrix symbol. Here the classical effective Hamiltonians are the eigenvalues of the matrix $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$. Obviously, they can be represented as the sum of the function $(p^h)^2/2 + v_{\text{ext}}^1(\mathbf{R}(x),t) + \phi(x,t) + \lambda^\nu(x)$ and the eigenvalues of the matrix W which, in general, depend on p^h. If they are distinct for all (p^h, x), then the semiclassical splitting of the adiabatic term occurs. Obviously, these classical Hamiltonians depend on the spin terms; hence the spin of a particle affects its phase trajectory as follows: the energy of longitudinal motion in the tube, in contrast to the total energy and the energy of transverse motion, is comparable with the spin energy.

The eigenvalues of the matrix W depend on the form of the transverse section of the tube and on the external fields. As the simplest example, we consider the case of the cylindrically symmetric crystal potential $(y_1 = \varrho\cos\phi, y_2 = \varrho\sin\phi)$ $v_{\rm int} = v_{\rm int}(\varrho)$, and $w^\nu = \exp(\pm i\nu\phi)u^\nu(\varrho)$. In this case, $\mathbf{Y} = 0$, the eigenvalues of the matrix Λ are $\pm\nu$, $M^1 = M^2 = 0$, M^0 is the diagonal matrix with elements $\pm\kappa\nu$, $\kappa = 2\pi\int_0^\infty(\partial v_{\rm int}(\varrho)/\partial\varrho)(u^\nu(\varrho))^2\,d\varrho$, and the adiabatic term splits into four semiclassical ones determined by the classical effective Hamiltonians $(H^h_{\rm eff})^\pm_{\uparrow\downarrow} = (p^h)^2/2 + (v^h_{\rm eff})^\pm_{\uparrow\downarrow}$,

$$(v^h_{\rm eff})^\pm_{\uparrow\downarrow} = v^1_{\rm ext}(\mathbf{R}(x),t) + \phi(x,t) + \lambda^\nu(x) \mp \frac{1}{2}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{H}\rangle\nu + \sigma_{\uparrow\downarrow}\left|\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{H} \pm \nu\mu^{-1}\alpha\kappa\partial_x\mathbf{R}\right|, \quad (5.10)$$

where $\sigma_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \pm 1$. In this case, we must assume that $|(1/2)\mathbf{H} \pm \mu^{-1}\alpha\kappa\nu\partial_x\mathbf{R}| \neq 0$. Otherwise, the effect of intersection of terms or of a change in the multiplicity of the characteristics occurs, where the standard semiclassical approximation does not work (see, e.g., [4]). In this example, the Hamiltonian system is also equivalent to the Newton system with the effective potential $(v^h_{\rm eff})^\pm_{\uparrow\downarrow}$. The semiclassical approximation must work for external fields $|\mathbf{H}| \lesssim 1\,$T, $E_{\rm ext} = |\nabla v_{\rm ext}| \lesssim 10^{-5}$V/nm. We also note that Eq. (5.9) can be treated as an equation with operator-valued symbol (its operator symbol is a matrix), and we can again apply the "operator" reduction to this equation.

c) Long-wave regime: $h = 1$. In contrast to the above regimes, for the "long-wave" approximation to exist, it is necessary to impose additional constraints on the value of the magnetic field. Formally, this follows from the existence of a term $\sim h^2/\mu$ in the Hamiltonian (5.5). The physical cause consists in the following. Even without the spin effects taken into account, the longitudinal and transverse modes are related due to the interaction between the magnetic field and the transverse orbital momentum, which is described by the term $-(2\mu)^{-1}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{H}\rangle\Lambda\otimes E_s$. In this case, the transverse energy significantly exceeds the longitudinal energy; hence the dynamics of longitudinal motion becomes very sensitive to small variations in the transverse energy. In turn, the transverse energy changes because of the variation in the magnetic field flux through the tube section due to a change in the angle between the plane of the tube transverse section and the vector of the magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$. For the magnetic fields $\sim 1\,$T chosen above, this interaction accelerates the particle to energies that are not consistent with the parameter h. To avoid the acceleration, we must take into account that $\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x) = \varepsilon^\nu_\perp(0) + \mu^2\lambda^\nu(x)$, and $\mathbf{H}_0 = 0$, $\mathbf{H} = \mu\mathbf{H}_1$. This means that we consider magnetic fields $\lesssim 10^{-2}\,$T. We also assume that the dimensionless constant of spin-orbit interaction is $\alpha \sim \mu^2$. This implies that the leading part of the Hamiltonian contains only the terms $L^\nu_2(0,x)|_{\mathbf{H}=0,\ v_{\rm ext}=0,\ \alpha=0}$. Subsequent calculations of this term (see item A3 in the Appendix) lead to the last term in (5.5). As a result, we obtain the limit reduced equation of the form

$$\left[\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + v^1_{\rm ext}(x) + \phi(x,t)\right)E_r\otimes E_s + (\partial_x\Phi)\Lambda\otimes E_s\left(-i\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right) + W\right]\psi^\nu = 0$$

$$W = \left(\lambda^\nu(x) - \frac{k^2}{8}\right)E_r\otimes E_s - \frac{1}{2}\langle\partial_x\mathbf{R},\mathbf{H}_1\rangle\Lambda\otimes E_s - E_r\otimes\frac{1}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma},\mathbf{H}_1\rangle + \mu^{-1}L_{sy}. \quad (5.11)$$

Here the semiclassical approximation cannot be used and any information about the solutions of the reduced equation (more precisely, about the systems of equations) can be obtained either by general qualitative methods or by numerical integration [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 57, 58, 89]. As already noted for the Helmholtz operator in plane one-mode waveguides, such an equation was first obtained in [55], where, in particular, it was proved that one can organize a single bound state in the waveguide by choosing an appropriate curvature of the waveguide. An equation similar to (5.11) and several consequences of it were obtained in [34, 35]. Eq. (5.11) works in the case where the correction L_1^ν is small. This imposes several constraints on the value of the constant-in-time component of the magnetic field $H_0 \sim \mu$ and on the constant of the spin-orbit interaction $\alpha \sim \mu^2$.

d) Ultrashort-wave regime: $\mu^{3/2} \ll h \ll \mu$. In the case of ultrashort-wave approximation, the external magnetic and electric fields can be stronger than those considered above. Namely, $v_{\text{ext}} \sim \mu^2/h^2$, $|\mathbf{H}(t)| \sim \mu/h$, $|\mathbf{H}| \lesssim 10\,\mathrm{T}$. Introducing the notation $v_{\text{ext}} = (\mu^2/h^2)v^1_{\text{ext}}$, $\mathbf{H}(t) = (\mu/h)\mathbf{H}_1(t)$ and omitting the primes, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}_0^\nu = H^h_{\text{eff}}\; E_r \otimes E_s + (h^2\mu^{-2})\varepsilon^\nu_\perp(x) + \mu\left(-\langle \mathbf{Y}_\perp, \mathbf{H}\rangle p^h + \left\langle \mathbf{Y}, \nabla v_{\text{ext}} + \frac{\partial \mathbf{A}_0}{\partial t} + k(p^h)^2\mathbf{n}\right\rangle\right),$$

$$\mathcal{L}_1^\nu = \Big(p^h(\partial_x\Phi) - 1/2\langle \partial_x\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{H}_1\rangle\Big)\Lambda - 1/2\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{H}_1\rangle + \mu^{-1}\alpha\Big(M^1 \otimes \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{n}_1\rangle p^h + M^2 \otimes \langle \boldsymbol{\sigma}, \mathbf{n}_2\rangle p^h\Big), \tag{5.12}$$

where $H^h_{\text{eff}} = (p^h)^2/2 + v_{\text{ext}}(x) + \phi$. Although $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$ is a matrix symbol in this case, its leading part is $H^h_{\text{eff}}\, E_r \otimes E_s$. Nevertheless, the matrix correction $\sim \mu > h$ can lead to the splitting of the adiabatic term and, in particular, to additional terms in the phase of the wave function $\sim \mu/h,\ \mu^2/h, \ldots$, which are, in general, different for each of the states contained inside the adiabatic term.

5.3 Examples of asymptotic solutions for some problems in nanotubes

As we mentioned above, here we have no opportunity to describe in detail asymptotic solutions of the effective equation of adiabatic motion in nanotubes and particularly to discuss concrete physical conclusions. This discussion requires a special publication (see [85]) and probably not a single one. Here we only want very briefly to outline the structure of semiclassical asymptotics for some natural problems.

Wave trains propagation. It is natural to formulate the problem of the wave train propagation for the reduced equation (5.6). We consider the general case when $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$ and $\mathcal{L}_1^\nu$ are matrices. Let H^h_{eff} be the certain eigenvalue of the matrix $\mathcal{L}_0^\nu$. If H^h_{eff} is degenerate, to restrict on the subspace corresponding to it, we can apply the reduction of §3 (by parameter h instead of μ) once again. So we have to restrict the operator $\mathcal{L}_1^\nu$ to the subspace corresponding to the eigenvalue H^h_{eff}. After the reduction our problem has the following form: the leading part of the matrix Hamiltonian is proportional to unity $r' \times r'$-matrix with coefficient H^h_{eff}, where r' is the multiplicity of degeneracy of eigenvalue H^h_{eff}, and $\mathcal{L}_1^\nu$ is a $r' \times r'$-matrix. Thus we always can reduce the problem of the construction of semiclassical solutions to the problem with the leading term proportional to unity matrix. We construct asymptotic solution assuming that the initial problem is reduced to this form. In order to not overload the notation we will write $\mathcal{L}_1^\nu$ for the matrix restricted to the proper subspace corresponding to eigenvalue H^h_{eff}.

Let $\psi^\nu(x, 0) = \psi_0(x) = \exp\left(\frac{iS_0(x)}{h}\right)\varphi_0(x)$, where the phase $S_0(x)$ is a smooth function and $\varphi_0(x)$ is $2r$-dimensional smooth vector function of $x \in \mathbb{R}$ with compact support $\mathcal{M}$. Then in the semiclassical approximation the solution to (5.6) is determined by solution to the Hamiltonian system (5.7) with Hamiltonian $H^h_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2}p^h + v^h_{\text{eff}}$, where v^h_{eff} depending on regimes of longitudinal motion are defined by formulas (5.8),(5.10) with initial conditions

$p^h(0) = \partial S_0/\partial x(x_0)$, $x(0) = x_0$. Denote its solution $p^h = \pi(t, x_0)$, $x = \xi(t, x_0)$. Suppose that $J(x_0, t) = \frac{d\xi}{dx_0} \neq 0$ for $t \in [0, t^*]$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{M}$. Then the equation $x = \xi(x_0, t)$ is uniquely solvable, $x_0 = X_0(x, t) \in \mathcal{M}$, and, for $t \in [0, t^*]$, the asymptotic solution to the Cauchy problem for system (5.6) with initial condition $\psi|_{t=0} = \psi^0(x, h)$ has the form:

$$\psi(x,t) = \left[\exp\left(\frac{iS(x_0,t)}{h}\right)\left(\frac{\varphi(x_0,t)}{\sqrt{J(x_0,t)}} + O(h)\right)\right]_{x_0 = X_0(x,t)}, \tag{5.13}$$

$$S(x_0,t) = S_0(x_0) + \int_0^t \left(\pi_i \frac{\partial H^h_{\text{eff}}(\pi,\xi,t)}{\partial \pi_i} - H^h_{\text{eff}}(\pi,\xi,t)\right) dt. \tag{5.14}$$

Function $\varphi(x_0, t)$ satisfies the following equation:

$$\frac{d\varphi}{dt} + i\mathcal{L}_1\varphi = 0 \tag{5.15}$$

with initial condition $\varphi(x_0, 0) = \varphi_0(x_0)$.

At $t > t^*$ the asymptotics of the solution is specified with the use of the Maslov canonical operator K_{Λ_t} (see [83, 90]) on the curves $\Lambda^1_t = \{x = \xi(x_0,t), p = \pi(x_0,t)\}$: $\psi = \mathbf{K}_{\Lambda_t}\psi_0$.

Remark. In the case of a finite effective potential the effect of splitting of incoming wave train into two space components can appear. They are partially reflected and partially transmitted, containing harmonics $E < \max v^h_{\text{eff}}$ and and $E > \max v^h_{\text{eff}}$, respectively.

Plane wave scattering. Consider the nanotube having the following structure. For $x < x_-$ and $x > x_+$ ($x_\pm = \text{const}$), this tube has rectilinear axis, constant torsion angles Φ^- and Φ^+, and the contraction coefficients D_- and D_+ at the ends. Suppose that $\mathbf{H} = 0$, v_{ext} and v_{int} do not depend on t, $v_{\text{ext}}(\mathbf{R}(x)) = \{v^-_{\text{ext}}$ for $x < x_-$, v^+_{ext} for $x > x_+\}$, $v_{\text{int}}(x,y) = \{v^-_{\text{int}}(y)$ for $x < x_-$, $v^+_{\text{int}}(y)$ for $x > x_+\}$. Then for $x < x_-$ and $E > v^-_{\text{ext}} + \varepsilon^\nu_-$, the system has a solution of the form $\exp((-iEt + ip_-x)/h)g^{\nu k}_-(y)$, $k = 1, \ldots, 2r$, which represents the plane wave propagating along the tube axis with vector (spinor) amplitude $g^{\nu k}_-(y)$. Vector $g^{\nu k}_-(y)$ and ε^ν_- are the eigenfunction and eigenvalue of the following problem, correspondingly:

$$\left(-\frac{1}{2}\frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial y^2} + v^-_{\text{int}}(y) + \alpha\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}, \hat{\mathbf{M}}\rangle\right) g^{\nu k}_-(y) = \varepsilon^\nu_- g^{\nu k}_-(y), \qquad \mathbf{n}_0 = \partial_x \mathbf{R}, \tag{5.16}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \partial_x\mathbf{R}\Big((\partial_1 v_{\text{int}})\partial_2 - (\partial_2 v_{\text{int}})\partial_1\Big) + \mathbf{n}_1(\partial_2 v_{\text{int}})p - \mathbf{n}_2(\partial_1 v_{\text{int}})p. \tag{5.17}$$

Remark. Note that eigenfunction $g^{\nu k}$ is not the product $w^\nu_j(y) \otimes \eta$ of "pure state" inside the term $w^\nu_j(y)$ and "pure spin state" η_k (η_k doesn't depend on y). It means that we can't separate spin states and states inside one term. Since the parameter $\alpha \ll 1$, to construct $g^{\nu k}$ one can use perturbation theory. To construct solutions in the case when $v_{\text{int}} = y_1^2 + y_2^2$ (parabolic confinement) one has to use second order of perturbation theory.

As exact solutions "at infinity" are not products of "pure states," we need to expand them with respect to the basis $w^\nu_j(y) \otimes \eta^k$. We obtain:

$$g^{\nu k}_-(y) = \|w^\nu_1(y), \ldots, w^\nu_r(y)\| \otimes E_s\varphi^-, \qquad \varphi^- = \{\varphi^-_1, \ldots, \varphi^-_{2r}\}^T. \tag{5.18}$$

The evolution of "initial scattering data" for reduced equation is determined by the following transport equation:

$$\frac{d\varphi}{dt} + i\mathcal{L}^\nu_1\varphi = 0, \qquad \varphi \to \varphi^-, \quad t \to -\infty. \tag{5.19}$$

The final scattering data for reduced equation is $\varphi^+ = \lim_{t\to\infty}\varphi(t)$. So we obtain the final scattering data for original problem in the form:

$$g_+^{\nu k'}(y) = \|w_1^\nu(y), \dots, w_r^\nu(y)\| \otimes E_s\varphi^+. \tag{5.20}$$

In the semiclassical approximation this problem has $2r$-dimensional family of asymptotic solutions of the form $\psi(x,E) \simeq \mathbf{K}_{\Lambda^1(E)}\{\varphi(t)\}$, where $\mathbf{K}_{\Lambda^1(E)}$ is the Maslov canonical operator on the nonclosed curve $\Lambda^1(E) = \left\{H^h_{\text{eff}} = E: \ p^h = p^h(t),\ x = x(t)\right\}$, t is the proper time (parameter on $\Lambda^1(E)$): $dx/dt = \pm\sqrt{2(E - v^h_{\text{eff}}(x))}$. Let $E > v^h_{\text{eff}}(x)$ for each x. Then with an accuracy exponential with respect to $h \to 0$, we have a passage of the incident wave above the barrier; as $x \to \pm\infty$

$$\psi(x,E,h) \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{p_\pm}} \exp\left(\frac{i}{h}p_\pm x\right)\varphi^\pm, \qquad p_\pm = \sqrt{2(E - v^-_{\text{ext}} - \varepsilon^\nu_-)}. \tag{5.21}$$

If $E < \max v^h_{\text{eff}}(x)$ at some points of the tube axis, then the incident wave is reflected off the barrier with an accuracy exponential with respect to h. In the domain $x < x_f(E)$, where x_f is the rotation point at the energy level $E = v^h_{\text{eff}}(x_f(E))$, $\psi(x,E,h)$ is the sum $\psi_- + e^{-i\pi/2}\psi_+(x,E,h)$ of the incident and reflected waves $\psi_\pm(x,E,h)$ with $x < x_f(E)$ (at $x > x_f(E)$ $\psi(x,E,h) = O(h^\infty)$). As $x \to -\infty$, we have

$$\psi_\pm \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \exp\left(\pm\frac{i}{h}px\right)\varphi^\pm. \tag{5.22}$$

The form of the nanotube after barrier modulo exponentially small corrections doesn't influence the solution. Therefore the part of the tube behind the barrier can be removed. One can see from the formulas (4.42) that the barrier appears not only because of the external potential but also because of the narrowing of the tube ($D(x) \to 0$). Thus the constructed asymptotics model the situation when the end of the tube narrows conically-like, this result in the appearance of a barrier, that is a turning point in the system (5.6). It results in sharp increasing of the wavefunction in the neighborhood of the conical end of the tube, this is probably related to the effect of the luminosity of the tube end.

Bound states. Asymptotic eigenvalues. Suppose that the potential v_{ext} and the magnetic field $\mathbf{H}$ do not depend on t and the effective potential $v^h_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{R}(x))$ has a stable minimum point x_0. In its neighborhood $v^h_{\text{eff}}(\mathbf{R}(x))$ has the form of a potential well, which generates a family of $T(E)$-periodic trajectories $\xi(t,E)$, $\pi(t,E)$ of system (5.7) parametrized by the energy $E = \frac{(p^h)^2}{2} + v^h_{\text{eff}}(x)$. Substituting them into (5.15) we obtain the system of the form $\dot\varphi = -G(t)\varphi$ with unitary matrix T-periodic with respect to t. We can form a basis in the space of their solutions from vector-functions of the form $z^j(t,E)\exp(i\beta^j(E)t)$, where $j = 1, 2, \dots 2r$, $z(t,E)$ are T-periodic in t, and the Floquet exponents $\beta^j(E)$ are real for all E. We choose them in such a way that $|\beta^j|$ are minimal. Let $E^{\nu n}$ be the levels determined by the Bohr-Sommerfeld quantization condition

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\oint \pi\, d\xi = \frac{1}{\pi}\int\limits_{x_{\min}}^{x_{\min}} \sqrt{2(E - v^h_{\text{eff}})}dx = h\left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right), \qquad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots \tag{5.23}$$

Then the numbers $E^{\nu n}_j = E^{\nu n} + h\beta^j(E^{\nu n})$, where $j = 1, 2, \dots, 2r$, give spectral series (sets of bound states) of the operator $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$; the $O(h^2)$-neighborhood of $E^{\nu n}_j(h)$ necessarily contains a point of its spectrum (continuous or discrete). Namely, if the spectrum of the original problem on the interval $E_0-\varepsilon, E_0-\varepsilon)$ is discrete, then the numbers $E_j^{\nu n}$ give the asymptotics of some of its eigenvalues. If the spectrum on this interval is continuous then these numbers apparently approximate the exponentially small bands of the spectrum (c.f. [91]).

The eigenfunctions corresponding to $E_j^{\nu n}(h)$ are determined with the use of the Maslov canonical operator.

5.4 Remark on rigorous justification of constructed asymptotic solutions.

It is natural to discuss the important question about the strict justification of asymptotic solutions, which can be constructed by using formal procedures suggested above. In this paper, we almost do not touch upon this problem (see §5.1) whose solution in general situation is not trivial and requires an additional investigation. To study this problem one can use at least two possible ways.

1) One has to prove that the asymptotic solutions are close to the exact solution of the initial problem under some conditions on the coefficients of the initial equation and on the function classes to which the solutions of the reduced equation belong. This way is based on the technique of obtaining a series of estimates with respect to the parameters μ and h from different diapasons.

2) The second way of justification is to estimate the accuracy of functions obtained, which approximate the exact solution of the initial equation. This way seems to be more useful, at least from the pragmatic viewpoint, since the obtained explicit asymptotic formulas for the solutions of real physical problems can be used.

5.5 Several effects in nanotubes generated by their geometry and external fields

Finally let us described very briefly several effects which one can obtain from the analysis of the asymptotic solutions constructed above. (Some of them have been already discussed in §5.1).

The possibility to model effective one-dimensional potentials. First let us mention elementary, but curious, properties of the above equations, which are caused by the possibilities of the nanotechnology: *changing the geometry of a tube placed in a homogeneous electric field, one can model different one-dimensional effective potentials.*

First, we consider a tube of constant section whose axis is a plane curve on the plane (r_1, r_2). Let the electric field of strength E_{ext} be directed along the Ox_2 axis. Then the effective potential has the form $\varphi = v_{\mathrm{ext}}\big(\mathbf{R}(x)\big) = E_{\mathrm{ext}}R_2(x)$. If the tube is curved not too much with respect to the axis r_1, then we have $x \approx r_1$. Thus, choosing the tube axis as an appropriate curve $r_2 = r_2(r_1)$, we can model the potential, the double potential well, etc.

As an example of a nonplanar tube, we consider the spiral $\mathbf{R}(x) = (\rho_1\cos(x/\sqrt{\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2}), \rho_1\sin(x/\sqrt{\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2}), \rho_2 x/\sqrt{\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2})$ ($\rho_1 = \mathrm{const}$, $\rho_2 = \mathrm{const}$ are parameters) in the field $E_{\mathrm{ext}}(0, \sin\alpha, \cos\alpha)$. The effective potential contains the *oscillating and linearly increasing* components: $\varphi(x) = -\sin\alpha E_{\mathrm{ext}}\rho_1\sin(x/\sqrt{\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2}) - x\cos\alpha E_{\mathrm{ext}}\rho_2/\sqrt{\rho_1^2+\rho_2^2}$. If $\alpha = \pi/2$, i.e., the field is directed perpendicular to the tube axis, then we obtain a periodic potential and the equations obtained above coincide in the first approximation with the Mathieu equation. If $\alpha = 0$, i.e., the field is directed along the tube, we obtain the Airy equation. A more complicated example is the case in which the tube axis is a winding of a torus: in this case, in particular, we can obtain almost periodic potentials. Similar results can be obtained by changing the thickness of the tube along the tube axis.

Dependence of the effective one-dimensional potential on the tube thickness. It is easy to show that for the above potentials modelling the "soft" and "rigid" walls, the effective one-dimensional potential of the longitudinal motion depends on the tube thickness $d_0(x)$ as $1/d_0(x)^2$. This dependence is a purely quantum effect and is caused by the effect of the size quantization. Thus, narrowing the tube, we obtain a barrier in the one-dimensional motion, while expanding the tube, we obtain a potential well or a "trap."

Semiclassical splitting of the adiabatic term. The "adiabatic" terms can split in the semiclassical approximation due to spin and the magnetic field. In particular, if the splitting is caused by spin effects, then spin affects the "classical" trajectory. For the case in which the adiabatic term is nondegenerate, we have $\Lambda = 0$. If degeneration exists, then the momentum matrix Λ is nonzero. This results in the appearance of an effective "dipole" that interacts with the projection of the magnetic field on the tube axis, and thus an additional phase of the wave function (the Berry phase) appears.

An increase in the electron density near the endpoint of the nanotube caused by reflection. Since the longitudinal energy decreases with decreasing cross-section of the nanotube, in a nanotube with a "closed" endpoint, the wave packet reflects from the closed endpoint. In this case, near the endpoint of the nanotube, there is a sharp increase in the electron density, which, apparently, is related to the effect of luminous emittance observed in nanotubes.

The Berry phase of the wave function. The term $[\Phi_x\Lambda - \langle Y_2\mathbf{n}_1 - Y_1\mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{H}\rangle] \otimes E_s p^h$ in the Hamiltonian (5.5) proportional to the momentum p^h can be excluded from this Hamiltonian by a change of the wave function. This change has the form

$$\psi^j = \exp\left(\int_{x^*}^{x} \lambda_j(x)dx\right)\psi'^j, \tag{5.24}$$

where $\lambda_j(x)$ is an eigenvalue of the matrix $\Phi_x\Lambda - \langle Y_2\mathbf{n}_1 - Y_1\mathbf{n}_2, \mathbf{H}\rangle$. In fact, the existence of this term results in the appearance of an additional phase of the wave function. This phase must be consistent with the boundary conditions at the endpoints of the tube, which gives a correction to the quantization condition. For example, we consider the Born–Karman boundary conditions that are equivalent to the case of a closed tube (the nanoannulus). While constructing the eigenfunctions in this case, it is necessary to require that the total phase of the wave function be 2π-periodic, with the above adiabatic correction taken into account. It is well known that the adiabatic phase responsible for the correction to the quantization condition is the so-called Berry phase.

If the magnetic field is zero, then the Berry phase is reduced to $\exp\left(\int_{x^*}^{x} \Lambda_j(x)d\Phi\right)$, where $\Lambda_j(x)$ is an eigenvalue of the momentum matrix Λ.

Ultrashort modes and the state density. The correction to $\mu\chi_1$ becomes comparable with 1 in the case $h = \mu^{3/2}$. This means that the adiabatic asymptotics of the form (4.37) ceases to hold. However, for $h < \mu$ and for the same total energy, there exists a state of the form (4.37) that belongs to the next subregion of the transverse quantization. From the physical standpoint, the fact that there is no asymptotic solution of the form (4.37) in the case of ultrashort waves in a curved tube means that such fast modes are destroyed in passing from a straight tube to a curved tube; they "fall" to the next subregions because of the interaction with the tube "walls."

The "instability" of ultrashort modes with parameter $h < \mu^{3/2}$ in a curved tube can lead to a change in the density of states and, in contrast to the straight nanotube, effectively increase the Fermi level (cf. [92]).

Spin beats. The operator L_{sy} in the semiclassical Hamiltonian, which corresponds to the spin-orbit interaction, leads to splitting of the adiabatic term into $2r$ semiclassical terms of the longitudinal motion. To each of the semiclassical terms, there corresponds, in general, its own phase $S_j^{\nu}(x,t)$, $j = 1, \dots 2r$. If the variation in the phase due to the spin-orbit interaction is small, then the phase can be expanded in a series in the constant of the spin-orbit interaction α. The zero term in the expansion corresponds to the classical motion of the "spinless" particle, and the correction results in the appearance of an envelope for the fast-oscillating exponential. Apparently, the appearance of such an envelope is related to the observed effect of the electron density beating along the tube [93].

6 Concluding remarks

Let us briefly summarize the results of this paper, sometimes repeating the above arguments. The adiabatic approximation is one of the main tools for analyzing the solutions of linear stationary and nonstationary problems in modern mathematical and theoretical physics. Different versions of adiabatic approximation are used in problems of molecular physics, solid-state physics, plasma physics, theory of internal and surface waves in fluids, averaging theory, quantum gravitation theory, etc.

The adiabatic approximation is used in situations in which the study of some classes of physically interesting wave process described by a "large" system with N degrees of freedom can be reduced, on some time intervals, to the study of a simplified "effective" system with $n < N$ degrees of freedom. In this case, on the one hand, a sufficiently wide range of states and solutions with some general characteristic properties (but not a set of individual concrete states or solutions) is considered, and, on the other hand, it is not assumed that all the solutions of the original "large" system can be described in the same way. From the physical viewpoint, this possibility is usually ensured by the fact that the problem has different spatial or spatio-temporal scales, which, from the mathematical viewpoint, means that there is a small parameter characterizing the different scales of the problem. As a rule, the different scales are manifested in different dependences of the coefficients of the original equation or boundary conditions on various variables (or groups of variables), i.e., on $(N-n)$ "fast" and n "slow" variables. Thus, it is natural to divide the study of such distinguished wave processes into two stages: 1) to derive "effective" reduced systems, 2) to find their concrete solutions and then to reconstruct the total solution describing the entire process. Of course, these considerations appear in different fields of physics and mechanics; the problem is to realize them in concrete formulas. Moreover, in each field, its own terminology is used. For example, such reduced systems correspond to terms in molecular physics, to modes in hydrodynamic problems, to subbands of dimensional quantization in nanophysics, etc. For various reasons, it is convenient for us to use the terminology accepted in physics of low-dimensional systems.

In turn, roughly speaking, the idea to derive simplified systems has two stages: 1) first, after the n above-mentioned degrees of freedom are "frozen" (it is assumed that the differentiation operators with respect to the slow variables commute with the slow variables), the operator determining the effective equation can be obtained as an eigenvalue of an auxiliary spectral problem with $N-n$ degrees of freedom; realizing this stage, we otbain effective Hamiltonians (or dispersion relations), well-known in molecular physics; 2) the operator (the "quantization" or the Peierls substitution) determining the effective reduced equation with n degrees of freedom is reconstructed simply by taking into account the fact that the differentiation operator with respect to slow variables does not actually commute with the slow variables. We note that the distinguishing of the "frozen" (slow) variables can be natural and obvious as, for example, in problems of molecular physics or in mechanical problems with different spatial scales, but can be more "latent" as in electron waves in crystals and in the averaging theory. In this case, an additional degree of freedom appears in the regularization of the problem.

In some problems, it is sufficient to perform the "naive" quantization of the effective Hamiltonian (of the dispersion relation), but, in many problems, a more accurate analysis is required and certain difficulties arise (see, e.g., [5], §56). We note that, as a rule, it is impossible to write the effective reduced equation exactly; the problem is to construct a minimally reasonable number of terms in the expansion of the operator in the effective reduced system, which allows a correct construction of the equation describing a wide range of wavelengths. Indeed, the most popular approach in the adiabatic approximation, originating from Born and Oppenheimer works, is based on the assumption that the desired solution depends smoothly on all the variables. Thus, for example, only the lower energy levels are usually "grasped" in spectral problems. At the same time, in many physical situations, for example, in describing the valence electrons in crystals, the higher energy levels are most interesting, but, strictly speaking, they cannot be considered under this approach. In this case, one can use the semiclassical theory proposed by Maslov, which, however, is based on the assumption that there is a sufficiently rigid relation between the excitation level and the parameter characterizing the different scales of the problem. From the mathematical viewpoint, this means that, in the problem under study, along with the parameter characterizing the different scales, which is naturally called an adiabatic parameter, there is another ("semiclassical") parameter characterizing the excitation level of the state under study; in this case, the form of the approximate (asymptotic) solution depends, as a rule, on the relations between these parameters. This can easily be verified comparing the averaging method, the Born–Oppenheimer method, and the Maslov method, which give solutions with "slow," "medium," and "fast" variations (with respect to the slow variables).

In this paper, we propose an approach based on the above considerations. This approach allows one, first, to describe all the states listed above, in the range from slowly varying states to fast or, sometimes, even "superfast" varying states, and, second, to classify them appropriately. In particular, this approach explains why the states obtained by the Born–Oppenheimer and Maslov methods can be treated as the states on the same subregions (terms) corresponding to different "longitudinal states." So the effective reduced equation thus obtained describes not only the states at the "bottom" of the subregion, but also the states corresponding to the higher energy levels. We note that, without this reduction, choosing the subregion for higher energy levels can be a rather complicated problem by itself.

The approach proposed here is based on Maslov's observation that the problems in which the adiabatic approximation is used can be interpreted as problems with operator-valued symbol, and these problems are well known in mathematical physics. This means that the operator determining the original "large" system is a function of two groups of operators with "small" and "large" commutators (or "large" anticommutators, as in the electron–phonon interaction problem). The use of the concept proposed in this paper, which is based on equations with operator-valued symbol, allows one to deal with different linear adiabatic problems from the unified viewpoint.

The realization of our approach is based on representing the solution in the form (3.5) and obtaining the effective reduced equation (3.7), which is a generalization of the Peierls substitution. These formulas, together with the algorithm described in §3, give one of the main results of the present paper. In these constructions, the key role is played by the techniques of noncommuting operators based on elementary notions from the Maslov operator method. The constructed algorithm allows us, with any prescribed accuracy, to calculate the operator determining the effective reduced equation (3.7) and the intertwining operator reconstructing the solution of the original problem from the solution of Eq. (3.7). In particular, the algorithm thus constructed allows one to obtain accurate estimates for the minimal number of terms necessary to construct the leading part of the asymptotic solution. It should be noted that, in the reduction procedure, the possible degeneration of the term (the effective Hamiltonian) must be taken into account. In §§4–5, these formulas are illustrated by several examples from different fields of physics and mathematics. Some heuristic arguments leading to formulas (3.5) and (3.7) are given in §2.

In §3, we also show that the "operator separation" of variables can be treated as a "quantum" (or wave) analog of the procedure of excluding (holonomic) constraints in classical mechanics ([36, 37] and others). Indeed, the imposed quantum constraints can be treated as the restrictions arising due to the confinement potential in the ambient configuration space. In this case, it is natural to assume that the "condition of dimensional quantization" is satisfied, i.e., the wavelength in the directions normal to the manifold corresponding to the degrees of freedom of the effective system (i.e., the "limit" manifold) is compatible with the "width of the film" surrounding the limit manifold. Here the most important is the fact justified in this paper that, excluding the constraints, one can, in general, obtain different effective Hamiltonians depending on the energy of the "longitudinal" motion. In the case of fast oscillating longitudinal states, this leads to different classical Hamiltonians determining the motion on the "limit manifold."

The study of solutions of reduced equations on some distinguished subregions is the second part of our approach. Depending on the relations between the parameters, this study can generally be performed by different methods. In §5, taking into account the fact that the problem contains two parameters, an adiabatic and a semiclassical, we classify the solutions, and this classification shows that the excited states are constructed differently than the lower states. In the construction of excited states, the momentum in the intertwining operator cannot be neglected, i.e., the intertwining operator is *indeed* an *operator* and cannot be replaced by a function, as it is usually done in different versions of the Born–Oppenheimer method (in particular, in solid-state physics). The existence of the momentum operator in the intertwining operator shows that, from the viewpoint of the Born–Oppenheimer method for excited states, a "distortion" of the term occurs. For fast varying solutions, the main methods in this case are the semiclassical approximation and the WKB-method; if there are turning points and caustics, then the WKB–Maslov method is used. It is well known that, in the realization of this method, one must pass to classical Hamiltonian systems. One of the elementary, but important, consequences is the fact that the classical systems can be different for different excitation levels and the "small" terms in the original equation can significantly affect the semiclassical characteristics for some values of the longitudinal energies. In particular, in the case of a degenerate adiabatic effective Hamiltonian, the degeneration can be removed in the semiclassical approximation; in this case, the adiabatic term "splits" into several semiclassical terms (Hamiltonians). We consider an example (nanotubes) and show that the interaction of spin with the confinement potential can change the classical trajectories of the longitudinal motion.

As was already noted, the possibility to obtain numerical solutions, graphs, etc. at this stage significantly depends on the specific character of a concrete problem and requires separate publications. In the present paper, we briefly describe this procedure for problems related to the modern field of nanophysics and restrict ourselves to rather general formulas.

In §5, we derive some simplest conclusions for models arising in nanophysics. In particular, we show that, placing nanotubes of various geometry in a constant electric field, we can model various one-dimensional potentials, for example, "double well" type potentials, periodic potentials, etc.; the degenerate adiabatic term (for example, in the case of a tube of circular section) can split into several semiclassical terms (effective Hamiltonians), etc. The problems concerning detailed studies of how the spin affects the classical trajectories, the electron density pulsation due to spin, etc. are beyond the framework of this paper.

We believe that the arguments and formulas given in this paper can be helpful in studying the problems arising in solid-state physics, hydrodynamics (waves on water), the theory of shells, plates, and rods, and in nanophysics. It seems possible that this method can be used in weakly nonlinear situations.

In conclusion, we make a remark concerning the list of references. As was already noted, the number of works dealing with the adiabatic approximation and its applications is extremely large; our list of references does not absolutely pretend to be complete; here we present only several papers that are to some extent close to our approach.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to S. Albeverio, J. Brüning, V.A. Geyler, K.V. Pankrashkin and I.V. Tyutin for useful discussions and valuable remarks. The work is supported in part by grants INTAS (00-257) and DFG-RAS (DFG 436 RUS 113/785, DFG 436 RUS 113/572/0-2).

References

1. M. Born and J.R. Oppenheimer, Zur quantentheorie der molekeln. *Annalen der Physik* 84 (1927) 457–484.

2. R.E. Peierls, *Quantum Theory of Solids*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press (1955) viii+229pp.

3. M. Born and K. Huang, *Dynamical Theory of Crystall Lattices*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press (1954) xii+420pp.

4. L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics (Nonrelativistic Theory). Theoretical Physics 3*. Moscow: Nauka (1989) 768pp. (in Russian).
   L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics: (Nonrelativistic Theory)*. In: *Theoretical Physics* 3. Oxford, London, Edinburgh: Pergamon Press (1965) ix+616pp.

5. E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics. Pt. 2. Theory of Condensed State. Theoretical Physics IX*. Moscow: Nauka (1978) 448pp.
   E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics. Pt. 2. Theory of Condensed State*. In: L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii (eds.), *Course of Theoretical Physics* 9. Oxford, London, Edinburgh: Pergamon Press (1980) x + 387pp.

6. V.P. Maslov, *Perturbation Theory and Asymptotic Methods*. Moscow: Moscow Univ. Publ. (1965) 549pp.
   V.P. Maslov, *Théorie des perturbations et méthodes asymptotiques*. Paris: Dunod, Gauthier-Villars (1972) xii+384pp.

7. M.V. Berry, Quantal phase factors accompanying adiabatic changes. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond.* A392 (1984) 45–57.

8. I.C. Percival, Semiclassical theory of bound states. *Adv. Chem. Phys.* 36 (1977) 1–61.

9. G.A. Hagedorn, A time dependent Born–Oppenheimer approximation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 77 (1980) 1–19.

10. Yu.Z. Miropol'sky, *The Dynamics of Internal Gravity Waves in Ocean*. Leningrad: Gidrometeoizdat (1981) 302pp.
    Yu.Z. Miropol'sky, *The Dynamics of Internal Gravity Waves in Ocean*. In: *Atmospheric and Oceanographic Sciences Library* 24. Dordrecht etc.: Kluwer Academic Publishers (2001) xvii+406pp.

11. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, Maslov's methods in linearized theory of gravitational waves on the liquid surface. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR* 269 (1983) 76–80.
    S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, Maslov's methods in linearized theory of gravitational waves on the liquid surface. *Sov. Phys. – Doklady* 28 (1983) 229–231.

12. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, Applications of Maslov's theory to two problems for equations with operator-valued symbols. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 39 (1984) 125 (in Russian).

13. L.V. Berlyand and S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, "Operator separation of variables" in problems of short-wave asymptotics for differential equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR* 296 (1987) 80–84.
    L.V. Berlyand and S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, "Operator separation of variables" in problems of short-wave asymptotics for differential equations with rapidly oscillating coefficients. *Sov. Phys. – Doklady* 32 (1987) 714–716.

14. V.P. Maslov, *Operational Methods*. Moscow: Nauka (1973) 544pp.
    V.P. Maslov, *Operational Methods. Transl. from the Russian*. Moscow: Mir Publ. (1973) 559pp.

15. V.P. Maslov, Nonstandard characteristics in asymptotic problems. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 38 (1983) 3–36.
    V.P. Maslov, Nonstandard characteristics in asymptotical problems. In: *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Warsaw, Aug. 16–24 1983)* 1, 2. Warsaw: PWN (1984) pp.139–183.

16. L.I. Schiff, *Quantum Mechanics*. New York–Toronto–London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. (1955) xii+417pp.

17. V.V. Belov, Semiclassical energy levels of a two-atom molecule in a magnetic field. *Izvestiya vuzov. Matematika* 6 (1976) 13–18 (in Russian).

18. G. Panatti, H. Spohn and S. Teufel, Effective dynamics for Bloch electrons: Peierls substitution and beyond. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 242 (2003) 547–578.

19. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and P.N. Zhevandrov, Asymptotic expansions and the Maslov canonical operator in the linear theory of water waves. I. Main constructions and equations for surface gravity waves. *Russ. J. Math. Phys.* 10 (2003) 1–31.

20. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, *Many-Phase Asymptotic Solutions to Linear and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations with a Small Parameter. Doctoral thesis*. Moscow: IPMekh Akad. Nauk SSSR (1988) 293pp. (in Russian).

21. M.V. Karasev and V.P. Maslov, Asymptotic and geometric quantization. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 39 (1984) 115–173.
    M.V. Karasev and V.P. Maslov, Asymptotic and geometric quantization. *Russ. Math. Surveys* 39 (1984) 133–205.

22. M.V. Karasev and V.P. Maslov, *Nonlinear Poisson Brackets. Geometry and Quantization*. Moscow: Nauka (1991) 366pp.
    M.V. Karasev and V.P. Maslov, *Nonlinear Poisson Brackets. Geometry and Quantization*. In: *Transl. Math. Monographs* 119. Providence, Rhode Island: AMS (1993) xi+366pp.

23. D.V. Anosov, Averaging in systems of ordinary differential equations with rapidly oscillating solutions. *Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat.* 24 (1960) 721–742 (in Russian).

24. V.I. Arnold, V.V. Kozlov and A.I. Neishtadt, *Mathematical Aspects of Classical and Celestial Mechanics*. In: V.I. Arnold (ed.), R.V. Gamkrelidze (ed.-in-chief), *Progress in Science and Technology. Current Problems in Mathematics. Fundamental Directions* 3 *(Dynamical Systems III)*. Moscow: VINITI AN SSSR (1985) 304pp.
    V.I. Arnold, V.V. Kozlov and A.I. Neishtadt, *Mathematical Aspects of Classical and Celestial Mechanics*. In: V.I. Arnold (ed.), R.V. Gamkrelidze (ed.-in-chief), *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences* 3 *(Dynamical Systems III)*. Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag (1988) xiv+291pp.

25. P. Lochak and P. Meunier, *Multiphase Averaging for Classical systems*. In: S.S. Antmann, J.E. Marsden and L. Sirovich (eds.), *Applied Mathematical Sciences* 72. Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag (1988) xi+360pp.

26. A.I. Neishtadt, Averaging in multi-frequency systems. II. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR. Mekhanika* 226 (1976) 1295–1298.
    A.I. Neishtadt, Averaging in multi-frequency systems. II. *Sov. Phys. – Doklady* 21 (1976) 80–82.

27. A.I. Neishtadt, The separation of motions in systems with rapidly rotating phase. *J. Appl. Math. Mech.* 48 (1984) 133–139.

28. K. Stefanski and H.C. Taylor, New approach to understanding quasiperiodicity in nonintegrable Hamiltonian systems. *Phys. Rev. A* 31 (1985) 2810–2820.

29. M.V. Berry, Classical adiabatic angles and quantal adiabatic phase. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 18 (1985) 15–27.

30. B. de Witt, Dynamical theory in curved spaces. I. Review of the classical and quantum action principles. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 29 (1957) 377–397.

31. H. Jensen and H. Koppe, Quantum mechanics with constraints. *Ann. Phys.* 63 (1971) 586–591.

32. R.C.T. da Costa, Quantum mechanics of constrained particle. *Phys. Rev. A* 23 (1981) 1982–1987.

33. R.C.T. da Costa, Constraints in quantum mechanics. *Phys. Rev. A* 25 (1982) 2893–2900.

34. M.V. Entin and L.I. Magarill, Electrons in a twisted quantum wire. *Phys. Rev. B* 66 (2002) 205308 [5 pages].

35. L.I. Magarill and M.V. Entin, Electrons in curvilinear quantum wire. *Zh. Exper. Teor. Fiz.* 123 (2003) 867–876.
L.I. Magarill and M.V. Entin, Electrons in curvilinear quantum wire. *J. Exper. Theor. Phys.* 96 (2003) 766–774.

36. P.C. Schuster and R.L. Jaffe, Quantum mechanics on manifolds embedded in Euclidean space. *Ann. Phys.* 307 (2003) 132–143.

37. V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. Moscow: Nauka (1974) 432 pp.
V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*. In: S. Axler, F.W. Gehring and K.A. Ribet (eds.), *Graduate Texts in Mathematics* 60. Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag (1978) x+462 pp.

38. V.P. Maslov, The characteristics of pseudodifferential operators and difference schemes. In: *Actes du Congrés Internationales des Mathématiciens (Nice, 1970)* 2. Paris: Gauthier-Villars (1971) pp. 755–769.

39. V.P. Maslov, *Mathematical Aspects of Integral Optics*. Moscow: MIEM (1983) 130 pp.
Journal version in: *Russ. J. Math. Phys.* 8 (2001) 83–105 and 180–238.

40. N.S. Bakhvalov and G.P. Panasenko, *Homogenization: Averaging Processes in Periodic Media. Mathematical Problems in the Mechanics of Composite Materials*. Moscow: Nauka (1984) 352 pp.
N.S. Bakhvalov and G.P. Panasenko, *Homogenization: Averaging Processes in Periodic Media. Mathematical Problems in the Mechanics of Composite Materials*. In: *Mathematics and Its Applications: Soviet Series* 36. Dordrecht etc.: Kluwer Academic Publishers (1989) xxxv+366 pp.

41. V.G. Vaks, *Interatomic Interactions and Bonds in Solids*. Moscow: IzdAT (2002) 256 pp. (in Russian).

42. M.I. Katsnelson and A.V. Trefilov, *Crystal Lattice Dynamics and Thermodynamics*. Moscow: IzdAT (2002) 382 pp. (in Russian).

43. V.S. Buslaev, Quasiclassical approximation for equations with periodic coefficients. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 42 (1987) 77–98.
V.S. Buslaev, Quasiclassical approximation for equations with periodic coefficients. *Russ. Math. Surveys* 42 (1987) 97–125.

44. V.S. Buslaev, Adiabatic perturbation of a periodic potential. *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* 58 (1984) 223–243 (in Russian).

45. A. Fedotov and F. Klopp, Anderson transition for a family of almost periodic Schrödinger equations in the adiabatic case. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 227 (2002) 1–92.

46. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, Resonances in asymptotic of a solution of the Cauchy problem for the Schrödinger equation with a rapidly oscillating finite-zone potential. *Mat. Zametki* 44 (1988) 319–340.
    S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, Resonances in asymptotic of a solution of the Cauchy problem for the Schrödinger equation with a rapidly oscillating finite-zone potential. *Math. Notes* 44 (1988) 1015–1033.

47. E.I. Blount, Bloch electrons in a magnetic field. *Phys. Rev.* 126, 5 (1961) 1636–1653.

48. S.P. Novikov and A.Ya. Maltsev, Topological Phenomena in Normal Metals. *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk* 168 (1998) 249–258.
    S.P. Novikov and A.Ya. Maltsev, Topological Phenomena in Normal Metals. *Phys.– Uspekhi* 41 (1998) 231–239.

49. W.P. Su, I.R. Schrieffer and A.J. Heeger, Soliton excitations in polyacetylene. *Phys. Rev. B* 22 (1980) 2099–2111.

50. J.M. Ziman, *Principles of the Theory of Solids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1964) xiii+360pp.

51. S.A. Brazovskii, I.E. Dzyaloshinskii and I.M. Krichever, Exactly soluble Peierls models. *Zh. Exper. Teor. Fiz.* 83 (1982) 389–404.
    S.A. Brazovskii, I.E. Dzyaloshinskii and I.M. Krichever, Exactly soluble Peierls models. *Phys. Lett. A* 83 (1982) 40–42.

52. I.M. Krichever, Algebraic curves and non-linear difference equations. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 33 (1978) 215–216.
    I.M. Krichever, Algebraic curves and non-linear difference equations. *Russ. Math. Surveys* 33 (1978) 255–256.

53. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and Yu.M. Vorob'ev, Semiclassical asymptotics for discrete models of electron-phonon interaction. *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* 57 (1983) 63–74.
    S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and Yu.M. Vorob'ev, Semiclassical asymptotics for discrete models of electron-phonon interaction. *Theor. Math. Phys.* 57 (1983) 993–1001.

54. S.I. Badulin, V.I. Shrira and L.Sh. Tsimring. The traping and vertical focusing of internal waves in a pycnocline due to the horisontal inhomogeneities of density and currents. *J. Fluid Mech.* 158 (1985) 199–218.

55. V.P. Maslov, Asymptotics of eigenfunctions of the equation $\Delta u + k^2 u = 0$ with boundary conditions on equidistant curves and the scattering of electromagnetic waves in a waveguide. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR* 123 (1958) 631–633 (in Russian).

56. E.M. Vorob'ev and V.P. Maslov, On the Single-mode open resonators. *Doklady Akad. Nauk SSSR* 179 (1968) 558–561 (in Russian).

57. P. Exner, A quantum pipette. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 28 (1995) 5323–5330.

58. K. Lin and R.L. Jaffe, Bound states and threshold resonances in quantum wires with circular bends. *Phys. Rev. B* 54 (1996) 5750–5762.

59. G.F. Dell'Antonio and L. Tenuta, Semiclassical analisys of constrained quantum systems. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 37 (2004) 5605–5624.

60. A.G. Voronovich, The propagation of surface and internal gravitational waves in approximation of geometric optics. *Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Fizika Atmosfery i Okeana* 12 (1976) 850–857 (in Russian).

61. S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, P.N. Zhevandrov, A.A. Korobkin and I.V. Sturova, Asymptotic theory of propagation of nonstationary surface and internal waves over uneven bottom. In: K.-H. Hoffmann and D. Mittelmann (eds.), *International Series of Numerical Mathematics* 106. Basel, Berlin etc.: Birkhäuser Verlag (1992) pp. 105–112.

62. J. Brüning, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and T.Ya. Tudorovskiy, Quantum and classical dynamics of an electron in thin film. In preparation.

63. S. Iijima, Helical microtubules of graphitic carbon. *Nature* 354 (1991) 56–58.

64. R. Saito, G. Dresselhaus and M.S. Dresselhaus, *Physical Properties of Carbon Nanotubes*. London: Imperial College Press (1998) xii+259 pp.

65. Ph. Avouris, T. Hertel, R. Martel, T. Schmidt, H.R. Shea and R.E. Walkup, Carbon Nanotubes: nanomechanics, manipulation and electronic devices. *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 141 (1999) 201–209.

66. L.A. Chernozatonskii, E.G. Gal'pern, N.R. Serebryanaya and I.V. Stankevich, Polymers of single-wall nanotubes: geometry, diffraction patterns, and electronic spectrum modeling. In: H. Kuzmany, J. Fink, M. Mehring and S. Roth. (eds.), *AIP Conf. Proc.* 486. Mellville, New York: American Institute of Physics (1999) pp. 284–305.

67. I.V. Stankevich, Diversity of carbon forms: hypothesis and reality. *Mol. Mat.* 7 (1996) 1–12.

68. A.V. Eletskii, Carbon nanotubes. *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk* 167 (1997) 945–972.
A.V. Eletskii, Carbon nanotubes. *Phys. – Uspekhi* 40 (1997) 899–924.

69. A.V. Eletskii, Carbon nanotubes and their emission properties. *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk* 172 (2002) 401–438.
A.V. Eletskii, Carbon nanotubes and their emission properties. *Phys. – Uspekhi* 45 (2002) 369–402.

70. V.Ya. Prinz, D. Grützmacher, A. Beyer, C. David, B. Ketterer and E. Deckardt, A new technique for fabricating three-dimensional micro- and nanostructures of various shapes. *Nanotechnology* 12 (2001) 399–402.

71. V. Gantmakher and Y. Levinson, *Carrier Scattering in Metals and Semiconductors*. Moscow: Nauka (1984) 350 pp.
V. Gantmakher and Y. Levinson, *Carrier Scattering in Metals and Semiconductors*. In: V.M. Agranovich and A.A. Maradudin (eds.), *Modern Problems in Condensed Matter Science* 19. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co. (1987) xviii+478pp.

72. V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and S.O. Sinitsyn, Asymptotic solutions of the Schrödinger equation in thin tubes. *Trudy Instituta Matematiki i Mehaniki UrO RAN* 9 (2003) 1–11.
V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and S.O. Sinitsyn, Asymptotic solutions of the Schrödinger equation in thin tubes. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.*, suppl. 1 (2003) S13–S23.

73. V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, S.O. Sinitsyn and T.Ya. Tudorovskii, Quasiclassical approximation and the Maslov canonical operator for nonrelativistic equations of quantum mechanics in nanotubes. *Doklady Akad. Nauk. Ser. Mat. Fiz.* 393 (2003) 460–464.
    V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov, S.O. Sinitsyn and T.Ya. Tudorovskii, Quasiclassical approximation and the Maslov canonical operator for nonrelativistic equations of quantum mechanics in nanotubes. *Doklady Mathematics. Ser. Math. Phys.* 68 (2003) 460–465.

74. V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and T.Ya. Tudorovskii, Quantum and classical dynamics of an electron in thin curved tubes with spin and external electromagnetic fields taken into account. *Russ. J. Math. Phys.* 11 (2004) 109–119.

75. V.M. Babich and V.S. Buldyrev, *Asymptotic Methods in Short Wave Diffraction Problems. Method of etalon problems*. Moscow: Nauka (1972) 456pp.
    V.M. Babič and V.S. Buldyrev, *Short-Wavelength Diffraction Theory: Asymptotic Methods.* In: H.K.V. Lotsch (ed.-in-chief), L.M. Brekhovskikh, L.B. Felsen and H.A. Haus (eds.), *Springer Series on Wave Phenomena* 4. Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag (1991), xi+445pp.

76. P.K. Rashevskii, *Riemannian Geometry and Tensor Analysis*. Moscow: Nauka (1967) 664pp.
    P.K. Rashevskiĭ, *Riemann'sche Geometrie und Tensoranalysis*. Berlin: Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften (1959) 606pp.

77. V.V. Kucherenko, Asymptotics of solution of the system $A(x, -ih\partial/\partial x)u = 0$ as $h \to 0$ in the case of characteristics of variable multiplicity. *Izvestiya Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat.* 38 (1974) 625–662 (in Russian).

78. A. Gordon and J. E. Avron, Born-Oppenheimer approximation near level crossing. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85 (2000) 34–37.

79. J. E. Avron and A. Gordon, Born-Oppenheimer wave function near level crossing. *Phys. Rev. A* 62 (2000) 062504-1 – 062504-9.

80. Y. Colin de Verdier and B. Parisse, Singular Bohr-Sommerfeld rules. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 205 (1999) 459–500.

81. T. Hertel, R.E. Walkup and P. Avouris, Deformation of carbon nanotubes by surface van der Waals forces. *Phys. Rev. B* 58 (1998) 13870–13873.

82. A.S. Davydov, *Quantum Mechanics*. Moscow: Fizmatgiz (1963) 748pp.
    A.S. Davydov, *Quantum Mechanics*. In: *International Series of Monographs in Natural Philosophy* 1. Oxford, London, Edinburgh: Pergamon Press (1965) xiii+680pp.

83. B.R. Vainberg, *Asymptotic Methods in Equations of Mathematical Physics*. Moscow: Moskow University Publ. (1982) 293pp.
    B.R. Vaĭnberg, *Asymptotic Methods in Equations of Mathematical Physics*. New York etc.: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers (1989) vii+498pp.

84. V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and T.Ya. Tudorovskiy, Asymptotic solutions of nonrelativistic equations of quantum mechanics in curved nanotubes. I. Reduction to spatially

one-dimensional equations. *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* 141 (2004) 267–303.
V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and T.Ya. Tudorovskiy, Asymptotic solutions of nonrelativistic equations of quantum mechanics in curved nanotubes. I. Reduction to spatially one-dimensional equations. *Theor. Math. Phys.* 141 (2004) 1562-1592.

85. V.V. Belov, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and T.Ya. Tudorovskiy, Asymptotic solutions to nonrelativistic equations of quantum mechanics in curved nanotubes. II. To appear in: *Teor. Mat. Fiz.*

86. A. Bensoussan, G.L. Lions and G.C. Papanicolaou, *Asymptotic Analysis for Periodic structures*. In: *Studies in Mathematics and its Applications* 5. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co. (1978) xxiv+700pp.

87. V.A. Marchenko and E.Ya. Khruslov, *Boundary-Value Problems in Domains with Fine-Grained Boundary.* Kiev: Naukova Dumka (1974) 279pp. (in Russian).

88. V.V. Jikov, S.M. Kozlov and O.A. Oleĭnik, *Homogenization of Differential Operators and Integral Functionals.* Berlin etc.: Springer-Verlag (1994) xi+570pp.

89. V.A. Geyler and I.Yu. Popov, Ballistic transport in nanostructures: explicitly solvable model. *Teor. Mat. Fiz.* 107 (1996) 12–20.
V.A. Geiler and I.Yu. Popov, Ballistic transport in nanostructures: explicitly solvable model. *Theor. Math. Phys.* 107 (1996) 427–434.

90. V.P. Maslov and M.V. Fedoryuk, *Quasiclassical Approximation for the Equations of Quantum Mechanics*. Moscow: Nauka (1976) 296pp.
V.P. Maslov and M.V. Fedoriuk, *Semi-Classical Approximation in Quantum Mechanics*. In: *Mathematical Physics and Applied Mathematics* 7, *Contemporary Mathematics* 5. Dordrecht etc.: D. Reidel Publishing Co. (1981) ix+301pp.

91. J. Brüning, S.Yu. Dobrokhotov and K.V. Pankrashkin, The spectral asymptotics of the two-dimensional Schrödinger operator with a strong magnetic field. *Russ. J. Math. Phys.* 9 (2002) 14–49 and 400–416.

92. N.A. Poklonski, E.F. Kislyakov, G.G Fedoruk and S.A. Vyrko, Electronic structure model of a metal-filled carbon nanotube. *Fiz. Tverdogo Tela* 42 (2000) 1911–1916.
N.A. Poklonski, E.F. Kislyakov, G.G Fedoruk and S.A. Vyrko, Electronic structure model of a metal-filled carbon nanotube. *Phys. Solid State* 42 (2000) 1966–1971.

93. S.G. Lemay, J.W. Janssen, M. van den Hout, M. Mooij, M.J. Bronikowski, P.A. Willis, R.E. Smalley, L.P. Kouwenhoven and C. Dekker, Two-dimensional imaging of electronic wavefunctions in carbon nanotubes. *Nature* 412 (2001) 617–620.